A short Reply vnto the last printed books of Henry Barrow and Iohn Greenwood, the chiefe ring-leaders of our Donatists in England:

VVherein is layd open their grosse ignorance, and foule errors: vpon which their whole building is founded.

By *George Gyfford*, Minister of Gods holy worde, in Maldon.

Imprinted at London by *Thomas Orwin*, for *Tobie Cooke*: and are to be solde at the Tygers head, in Paules Churchyard.

1591



To the Reader.

THere were (good Christian Reader) foure haynous accusatiõs laid against the Church of England, for which the accusers haue condemned her, & all her publique assemblies, as most wicked Antichristian Idolatrous synagogues of Sathan. I shewed how falsely they doo accuse, and howe presumptuously agaynst God they doo condemne: And that indeede they are the very same with the auncient Donatists. They haue replyed and published in print their defence, but their bookes are intercepted: yet some few haue escaped, and are dispersed among theyr fellowes. Wherefore I hold it needfull to publish some answere, not dealing with euery error and absurditie, (for that would aske the trauaile of some yeares) but onely with the chiefe grounds of their Schisme. In this, I trust euery simple man that hath a Christian heart, shall see the effectuall power of Sathan, when he turneth himselfe into the likenes of an Angell of light, to seduce ignorant men, which are lifted vp in their mindes, with opinion of their knowledge: For being men vnlearned (onely some little froth excepted, I speake thus because they peruert that little which they haue read in other mens writings, in sundry poynts) yet as if they were sent from heauen with reuelations, or as great Apostles, they take vpon them to confute, and controll, and condemne all Churches, and all the most worthy Instruments which GOD hath raysed vp in these last times. For knowe this (good Reader) that the foure accusations which they haue brought agaynst the Church of England, to condemne her,

are also (though with some differences) brought against all Churches in *Europe*, and that in expresse wordes in these their last bookes. For the prescript formes of prayers, which all the Reformed Churches doo vse, they condemne as most horrible and abhorred blasphemie. The people (they say) are prophane multitudes. They say, that in all *Europe*, & in all these knowen partes of the world there is no minister of Christ. The gouernment by Elderships, they condemne as a most proude thing, as being without any warrant of Gods word. Doo but reade ouer these fewe things which I haue noted out of their bookes: and iudge how fit they be for such a worke as they haue taken in hand, & whether it be like that GOD hath sent them, euen as it were *Moses* and *Aaron*, to conduct his people out of *Ægipt*, from vnder the bondage of *Pharaoh*, for so they take it; as appeareth by their owne wordes, speaking of those which cleaue vnto them. Many they see by Gods mightie hand (say they) escaped, and marching with the banner of the Gospell displayed, before all the inchaunters of *Ægipt*, and *Pharaoh* his troupes, *pag.* 5. of the Epistle. And if it seeme lost time to stand vpon such grosse things: yet take this profit, as to see how needfull it is not to be high minded, and presumptuously bolde in Gods matters, but to

feare and tremble with

Humilitie.

To Maſter *Barrow*, and Maſter *Greenwood*.

YE complaine much of hard dealing offered you, and ſay ye are blaſphemed with odious tearmes. And if ye doo erre, your deſire is to be reduced by a Chriſtian manner. It is certaine when men are cleane awaye in ſimplicitie, & the matter toucheth but themſelues, they are to be dealt withall without ſeeking their diſgrace: But when they be publike and notorious ſeducers, defacing Chriſts Miniſters, and many poore ſheepe of Chriſt are in hazard to be ſpoyled. They that take it to be vncharitable dealing, to diſcloſe, and to paynt out ſuch ſeducers in their colours, and to diſgrace them vterly, to the end that the ſimple may not be ſpoyled by the as a praie, doo want ſome iudgement. For as it is Chriſtian charitie in the Shepheards to deale meekely with the ſheepe, ſo is it high treachery and vnfaythfull dealing to Chriſt and his Church, when the VVoolfe dooth come in ſheepes clothing, not to pluck it off, and to let the ſheepe ſee that he is a VVoolfe. VVhy elſe did our Sauiour call the Phariſies, hypocrites, Serpents and generations of Vipers? VVhy ſayd S. Paule of the falſe Apoſtles, beware of dogges? Ye haue drawen many into an outra-

gious presumption against God and his people, flat contrary to the rules of his holy word, as shall appeare in the discourse. To hauerent out of the hearts of many, all reuerence and loue towards the preachers of the Gospell, and led them into such a presumptuous opinion of their owne vnderstanding, that if they become not heretikes, yet experience doth teach, that many of them growe into irreligious prophanenes. Master Barrow *and Master* Greenwood, *I doo not know your persons, and I protest vnto ye, there is no priuate thing hath moued me to seeke your disgrace, but indeede the care of Christs sheepe. And let it appeare by the things which follow whether I haue done ye any wrong.*

BRITISH MUSEUM 121174

A ſhort Replie vnto the laſt printed *Bookes of Henry Barrow and* Iohn Greenwood, the chiefe *ringleaders of our Donatiſtes* in England.

I Did lay to your charge (M. Barrow and Maſter Greenwood) a matter very haynous and deteſtable; yea, moſt odious in the ſight of euery good man, as namely intollerable pride, preſumption, and wicked intruſion into Gods office, for that ye vtterly condemne and abandon, all our aſſemblies, as haynouſly, faulty, and ſo wilfully obſtinate, in ſuch principall tranſgreſſions, as that they haue forfayted the couenent and are ſeparated from the fayth and communion of Chriſt. I ſet downe reaſons from Gods word to conuince yee in this, that if it pleaſed God ye might repent for this ſauage crueltie, by which ye indeuour to rend and teare vp all the Lords tender plants: If not, yet that others might ſee, & tremble at your inordinate and outragious boldenes.

Vnto this ye haue replied; ſtiffly affirming, and labouring to maintayne, that ye haue rightly condemned and caſt foorth our aſſemblies as moſt wicked Antichriſtian Synagogues. Adding moreouer, that ye lie in priſon as Chriſts poore afflicted ſeruants, the Lords witneſſes againſt vs, that your bonds and ſufferings are glorious, and that I as a wicked falſe Prophet, and as a marked ſeruant of Antichriſt, haue vncharitably

vncharitably, reuiled ye, both for those former wordes, as also that I that tearme you Donatistes, Schismatikes, &c.

If ye be Christs seruants, and haue iustly accused, condemned, and cast forth, doing no more that Christ hath sent ye for, and authorised ye to doo, then haue I vnchristianly and as a false Prophet indeede, reuiled ye and your glorious sufferinges. But then take this withall by the way, that the Donatists in olde time, and the Annabaptists of late daies, were Christs poore afflicted seruants, & Gods witnesses, & that the Churches and their ministers did vnchristianly reuile them and their glorious sufferings. For I haue giuen yee none other tearmes then the Churches gaue them: And if in the chiefe poyntes of Donatisme ye be not full Donatists, and so holde sundry poyntes of Annabaptisme, being fallen into their tents and as outragiously fighting against all Churches, and with the same weapons that they did, and with as blinde fury condemning them, as those other, let me be accounted for no better indeede than a lying Prophet.

Your words are many, and great are your outcries, but let vs see how well ye defend and cleare your selues by them, from this most wicked intrusion into Gods office. I set down first against ye, that he doth wickedly and proudly thrust himselfe into Gods office, which taketh vpon him to iudge and condemne any one man to be no true Christian, which holding the place and dignitie of a brother in Gods Church and professing the fayth soundly, studieth to please God, for the common errors and frailties vnto which euen the most perfect are subiect, because the holy scriptures speaking of the regenerate, haue these sayings: *We know but in part*, 1. Cor. 13. *who vnderstandeth his errors.* Psal. 19. *And in many things wee sinne all.* Iam. 3. Then how much more intollerable is their wicked presumption and intrusion into Gods office, which take vpon them vtterly to condemne as quite separate from Christ all the assemblies in a kingdome, which professing the Gospell, haue many particuler members in them, that earnestly indeuour to please God, and are not spotted with any grosse errors or notorious offences?

Then

Then further doe I alleadge, that as a brother hath his place and dignitie in a Christian assemblie, so our Church of England hath her place and dignitie among all the godly Churches: which for the fayth that shee doth together with them publiquely professe, and sincerely in all the principles and grounds of the holy Christian religion, doe not only allow her the place, but also do regarde and loue her, giuing vnto her the dignitie of a sister, yea euen of a mother in Israel, because shee hath not beene barren, but hath brought forth many deare children to God, and not a few of them crowned with martyrdome. Ye haue not (Master Barrow) answered one worde vnto al this, but haue with deepe silence slipt past it.

But ye say, He that is in his conscience conuinced of errors and doth persist in them, is wilfully obstinate, and so euidently declareth that he hath no faith. And in this case yee say is the Church of England, it holdeth errors and is conuinced in them, and yet persisteth to defend and teach the same, and therefore it is quite seperated from Christ.

Agaynst this I set downe, that a brother offending, is not to be iudged so wilfully obstinate, as that he is to be cast forth and condemned to be but as an heathen, because he is conuinced of his sinne and error by priuate admonitions, and doth persist, but when the admonition and censure of the Church is despised. For our Sauiour sayth not, If hee will not heare thee count him as an heathen, or if thou take one or two with thee, and he will not heare them: *But if he will not heare the Church, then let him be vnto thee as an heathen.* Math. 18. This ye haue not answered, for ye can shew no place in Gods worde, where this power is giuen to priuate men, but onely to the Church. And yet persist in this most horrible intrusion, forgetting the precept, *Iudge not that ye be not iudged,* Math 7. *and he that condemneth his brother, condemneth the lawe: and thou condemnest the law, thou art not an obseruer of the law, but a Iudge.* Iam. 4. vers. 11. And therefore we must heare enter into a larger discourse about it. I will first set downe that which yee bring to maintayne your doing.

We doubt not (say you) neither euer thought, but the best

Church, that consisteth of mortall men may fall, either of negligence or ignorance into grieuous offences and dangerous errors: yea wee doubt not but that some famous Churches and Christians may fall into such errors, as he termeth fundamentall: the holding whereof should vtterly subuert the faith. As in the Church of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, and *Asia*, there were &c. But this wee holde withall, that no true Church or Christian will maintaine any sinne or error, when it is euidently shewed and conuinced vnto them by the word of God, &c. To your second charge we answer, that wee haue learned to put difference, betwixt error and heresie. All good men (as is sayd) doo and may erre, but no good man will defend or persist in his error, when it is shewed and conuinced vnto him. Obstinacie ioyned vnto error after it is duely conuinced, maketh heresie. Further, we say that any error, being obstinatly holden and taught, after it is duely reprooued and conuinced vnto him maketh an heretick, and heresie in that partie, or in that congregation that so holdeth and teacheth it, doth separate from the faith and communion of Christ. Wherefore we can but wonder at your ignorance who stand for a teacher in your Church, and yet hold some errors obstinatly held and taught agaynst the trueth of GOD, not to be heresies, or (at the least) not to be fundamentall, &c.

In these woꝛds (Maſter Barrow) which I doubt not, ye will acknowledge, lieth the whole defence and cléering of your selues from that wicked and pꝛesumptuous intrusion into Gods office, which I haue layd to your charge. I am sure (that in your imagination) ye vtter in them most diuine & vndoubted pꝛinciples, oꝛ els how could yee bꝛing in your conclusion of such wonder at mine ignoꝛance, standing foꝛ a Teacher in our Church? Then must we stand and wonder each at other: foꝛ I doo indeed greatly wonder to see how strong the illusions of Satan be, when he is turned into the likenes of an Angell of light, that such men as you (taking vpon ye, not to stand as teachers in some particular Churches, but to controule all Churches, and all the learned teachers that haue been since the Apostles, as if yee were sent from heauen with speciall knowledge aboue all others) should

in

in so fewe words bewray so much confused palpable ignorance, and absurd errors. In very deede vnder this streame of words lieth one of the chiefe rocks vpon which ye are runne, and against which ye cause many a simple soule to dash with great hazard, leading them into the same wicked presumption agaynst God, which your selues are fallen into. The reader shall see plainly, that here is no cléering your selues from that soule intrusion into Gods office, vnlesse the heaping vp of errors may be déemed cléering. I will begin first with the difference which (ye say) ye haue learned to put betwixt error and heresie. The onely difference which ye make is the obstinate persisting in it, and teaching it, after it is conuinced vnto him that erreth. Which is nothing els indeede but confusedly in stead of putting difference betwixt error and heresie, to note the difference betwixt a man that erreth in simplicitie, and an hereticke. In deed because S. Paule sayth, *That an hereticke is peruerted and sinneth condemned of himselfe.* Tit. 3. *And that such cause offences and diuisions contrary to the wholesome doctrine which we haue learned.* Rom. 16. We hold them not hereticks vnlesse they bee conuinced, and obstinatly despise the iudgement of God, and the iudgement of the Church, conuincing them by the light of the word, and seeke to peruert others and to draw them into their faction. But will it hereupon followe that no error is of it selfe an heresie, vnlesse it light into such a man as obstinatly will holde and teach it? Or that euery error (euen the least) by obstinacie of man ioyned with it, becommeth heresie? Then you say thus in effect, euery error is an heresie, no error is an heresie. This (Master Barrow) is your déepe skill which ye boast of that ye haue learned: for if the man put the difference by his obstinacie, it must needes be so. Then let me aske ye where ye haue learned þ to deny the vnitie of the Godhead, is not an heresie, or þ trinitie of persons in the same, or to deny that Christ is God, or that he is man, vnlesse the man that erreth in them be conuinced and found obstinate? Are not these and such like, heresies in themselues, although the men that erre in them be not conuinced and hold them ignorantly? Agayne, shew vs where ye haue learned, that euery error, euen to the least, being in an hereticke becom-

meth an hereſie. Thus may the reader ſee how confuſedly ye haue put that to diſtinguiſh errors, which doth but diſtinguiſh betweene the men that do erre.

In the next place, where you ſay, that the error muſt be duely conuinced vnto the conſcience of the man that erreth, before he can be ſo wilfully obſtinate, as doth ſeparate him from the faith and from the communion of Chriſt: ye ſpeake ſome trueth, but ye ſpeake ye knowe not what. For if ye could ſee, it is ſo farre from clearing ye, from preſumptuous intruſion into Gods office, that it vtterly ouerthroweth ye; and your former words and ſomewhat which ye write elſewhere in this booke being laid with it, becommeth a very ſnare for to hold ye. Ye haue accuſed the Church of England, condemned, and caſt her forth for wilful obſtinacie, as quite ſeparated from Chriſt; now let vs ſee how duely ye haue conuinced our whole Church all the aſſemblies, and all the particular members in the ſame, and found them hereticks. Firſt remember your owne words in this place; that ye doubt not, neither euer thought, but that the beſt Church which conſiſteth of mortall men, may fall either of negligence or ignorance, into grieuous offences and dangerous errors, and that ſome famous Churches and Chriſtians may fall into ſuch errors, as I terme fundamentall. &c.

Touching the faults which you charge the Church of England withall in our worſhip, in our people, in our Miniſtrie and gouernment Eccleſiaſticall, albeit in the whole courſe of your writings your ſpeaches be merueilous exceſſiue, yet in the 180. 181, 182. pages of this your booke againſt me, ye plainly confeſſe them to bee ſuch as right excellent Chriſtians haue ignorantly erred and dyed in. For ſpeaking of thoſe which ſuffered death for religion in our Church, ye call them godly Martyrs, ſaying; that ye doubt not of their happie and bleſſed eſtate, all their ſinnes, and theſe falſe offices and miniſtrie which they executed in their ignorance among the reſt, being forgiuen them. Theſe be your owne words (Maſter Barrow) which I haue ſet downe. You acknowledge them to bee godly bleſſed Martyrs, they erred (you ſay) in theſe things, but of ſimplicitie through ignorance. If thoſe principall men were ignorant in

theſe

these matters, then is it no meruaile if all the rest in the land were ignorant in them, which imbraced the Gospell. Upon this it followeth, that the Church of England was or might bee a true Church, vntill such time as she was duely conuinced of her errors and found obstinate. And if she hath not been duely conuinced, and found in such wilfull obstinacie, as doth quite separate from the faith, and from the communion of Christ, then is she still or may bee the true Church hauing (it may bee for ought that you knowe, and there is no likelihood to the contrarie) many thousands in her, which are readie to shed their bloud for the holy Gospell of Christ. And then how wicked, and how accursed is your presumption in condemning her vtterly?

Nay (say you) but she is conuinced and all your assemblies, and found so wilfully obstinate in maintayning her errors euen against her knowledge, that she hath forfaited the couenant, and is separated from the communion of Christ.

This is your bare accusation, you may not carry away the matter so (for then indeede ye may easily cleare your selues from wicked intrusion into Gods office) but wee must examine (seeing ye graunt there must be a due conuincing) first what it is to be duly conuinced, then, when, and by whome she hath been in such sorte, or so duly conuinced as ye charge her, and yet found obstinate. This is the rule, that one brother offending is not to loose the dignitie and place of a Christian, and to be reputed as an heathen, vntill such time as he bee conuinced by the Church, and found so obstinate that he doth despise her iudgement and authoritie. This is the onely due conuincing, and here is the onely power to cast forth as heathen, a man in some offence conuinced. And shall not a Church haue as great priueledge as a man? Is it not more then absurd, to say, one man cannot be cast foorth as an heathen for obstinacie in some offence against priuate admonitions, but whole Churches may? All the true Churches haue conuinced the Church of Rome, and condemned her as obstinate, not in some light offences, in which true Christians may erre, but as most blasphemous and Idolatrous against the principles of faith and grounds of Religion, teaching that no Christian man ought to ioyne with her. But

what Churches are they which haue conuinced the Church of England of such errors, and found her so obstinate, that they haue condemned her and willed all men to forsake her? O M. Barrow, you shall finde that all the godly Churches are so farre from this, that contrariwise they acknowledge her for a sister. Looke then againe vpon your horrible presumption, and see who hath giuen you such power aboue and agaynst all Churches? If ye minde obstinately to persist in your euill without warrant, and euen agaynst this manifest worde of God, (being much better ye should fall downe and bewayle your vngodly wayes, and seeke for pardon) ye haue no way to shift or to colour your wickednes but this, that men may bee conuinced of error by particular persons, and that so hath the Church of England beene duly conuinced. It is out of all doubt that men which erre may be conuinced by any particular persons whatsoeuer, for it is the power and light of Gods worde onely which conuinceth: but that which maketh men to be cast forth as heathen for obstinacie when they are conuinced, is not (as I haue shewed) obstinacie agaynst priuate admonitions, but the despising the iudgement and power of the Church when she hath conuinced and reproued. So that your passage is here agayne stopped, and ye are cut off: but yet I will follow ye in this, yeelding this scope, to see when or who they be of particular persons which haue duely conuinced the Church of England and al her assemblies of such errors. First for the martyrs in our Church, yee haue set them vpon the shore safely landed, out of all danger of wilfull obstinacie: for pag. 181. thus ye write.

These godly martyrs, so lately escaped out of the smoakie furnace of the popish Church, coulde not so clerely discerne, and sodainely enter into the heauenly, and beautifull order of a true established Church. And those godly men being so vnexpert, and vnexercised in his heauenly worke, neuer hauing long liued in, seen or heard of any orderly communion of Saints, any true established Church vpon the earth of so many hundreth yeares, neuer since the generall defection of Antichrist, no meruaile, (I say) if they erred in setting vp the frame. But what then should we persist in their errors? espe-

cially

cially should we reiect the true patterne of Christs Testament, &c.

Thus farre be your wordes Master Barrow, in which the reader may see, that ye haue (as I say) landed those godly men out of all daungers, which set vp the frame of our Church, because they did (as you say) nay they could see no better: But our Church now can not be excused, because she hath reiected the heauenly patterne being brought. Indeede I am of this minde (to answere your wordes as they lye) that right excellent men come short in some things about the ordering of Gods Church, and especially at the beginning, because time is a teacher: But those men were not so blinde as you make them, or so vnexpert in the heauenly worke. Many of them liued long after they came out of popery. They did read the scriptures, both for other poynts of doctrine and for the gouernement, and all the auncient histories of the Church, and (in my iudgement) might haue bin able in those dayes, after twenty years separatiõ frõ popery, to see as much as some in these dayes that haue bœn but foure or fiue yeares from the Bowling Alleyes. Agayne, I am of this mind, that when any error in the Church appeareth, it ought (if it can bee brought to passe) to be reformed: And that they doo greeuously sinne which reiect the truth agaynst their knowledge and conscience to the dammage of Gods people, but there lieth the matter howe you can proue that our Church is conuinced. We must see who they bee that haue layd this patterne which ye speake of before her, which was not layd before those blessed martyrs, and conuinced her: let vs come to the matter. In some Ceremonies, and in the manner of gouernment, our Church doth differ from other Churches: Those Churches (indeede) haue shewed their reasons, why they vse not such ceremonies and gouernment: but yet they condemne not our Church, for not being perswaded by them: for they do know that in some matters of controuersie, it falleth out often, that men may thinke they haue truth and be deceiued, also that the truth may be shewed, and yet men that erre not conuinced in their conscience vnto whom it is shewed. This is your great ignorance (Master Barrow) which imagine

gine that so soone as a truth is shewed in any matter, the partie that erreth is by and by conuinced in his conscience. There were thousands in the Church of Ierusalem, Act. 21. which erred grosse about the retayning the ceremoniall law, and the holy Apostles were driuen to beare with them, when they could not perswade them from it, and that many yeares. And who can conuince errors like the blessed Apostles? And you must consider here further, that euen those martyrs in our Church whom you so fully cleare, had the same paterne layd before them then, which our Church hath had layd before her since: for they did know that there was another forme of gouernement vsed at *Geneua*, and in some other places, and they did not onely reade their writings which shewed the reasons for the same, but also some of them, as Bishop Hooper, and Archdeacon Philpot, were trauailers euen to that ende and purpose, and liued in some & did see, if not al, yet some number of the reformed Churches beyond the seas. Moreouer, the rest of the martyrs had here among them out of diuers reformed Churches, as Peter Martyr, Bucer, Fagius, Alasco, and others. Howe ignorantly then, and how falsely Master Barrow, doo ye affirme that those godly martyrs, had neuer liued in, seene, nor heard, of any orderly communion of Saints, any true established Church? If those martyrs, had the very same patterne layd before them which hath bene layd since before our Church, and were not conuinced? Peraduenture you will say, it was nothing so fully and so clearely brought and layd it before the martyrs as it hath been layd before our Church. Then if I demaund here, who they be that haue more fully and more clearely layd this patterne before our Church, and thus conuinced her; whether your selues alone, or partly your selues and partly others. I suppose, yee will take it but in parte vnto your selues: let vs then begin with these other, and then come to you. The Church of England at the first (as you cõfesse) set vp the frame as they were perswaded in conscience to be very right and agreeable to Gods word. Since that there hath risen controuersie at home about some Ceremonies and obseruations, and about the gouernement. Reasons and allegations haue beene

brought

brought, to shew that there be hurtfull things amisse in both: and many are perswaded. But now the visible Church of England, the prince and all those which exercise the chiefe power therein haue stood and doe stand resolute, that the ceremonies and obseruations are agreeable to Gods worde, or at the least not contrary, but tollerable; and that gouernement is such as is by Gods word most fit and profitable for our Church. They stand upon their reasons and allegations for this: And many thousands in the land both men and women which professe the Gospel and faych of Christ; either know not what the things in controuersie, or, if they doe knowe them, yet are perswaded that our worship and gouernment are right. Tell me then M. Barrow (seeing ye confesse the martyrs were not conuinced) how you know for certainetie that all these are conuinced in their conscience (because matters haue been more fully opened) and so continue wilfully obstinate against the knowen truth? Hath God giuen you some speciall reuelation, or doe yee knowe the secrets of all mens hearts? You see by the Church in Ierusalē that men may ignorantly remayne still in error, if the blessed Apostles themselues should lay downe matter against the same unto them. But to conuince you, I may reason from your own words, for Master Barrow, if that be true which you holde, touching gouernment ecclesiasticall (which is the chiefe matter in question) the Church of England cannot bee conuinced by that which either our owne or men of other Churches haue set foorth. We haue beene perswaded that the gouernement ecclesiasticall ought to be by one of these two, that is to say, either by Bishops or by presbyteries, and you condemne both. The gouernement by Bishops ye terme Antichristian: And of those which stand for a gouernement by Presbyteries thus you write pag. 189. of your other booke.

These men would bring in a new adulterate forged gouernement in shew, or rather in despight of Christs blessed gouernement, which they in their pride, rashnes, ignorance and sensuallity of their fleshly hearts, most miserable immondte corrupt and peruert. Also in the pag. 166. you terme it a deuilish forgerie. In this booke against mee you call it a pre-

[illegible] yee say it hath no ground in the word of God, but vtterly subuerteth the whole order and communion of the Church, &c. pag. 79.

Is it so Master Barrow, then how hath our Church been conuinced in conscience, by those which bring no warrant of Gods word for that which they would set vp? being vndoubtedly perswaded (as I haue sayd) that one of the two ought to be, (a third as yet not hauing been shewed) how haue they (I say by your speach) been so duely conuinced? And further it may bee sayd, which is of great force against ye, that if all the learned men in other Churches, and those in our Church which stand for the gouernment by Presbyteries, haue erred so grosely as you accuse them, why may not they that maintaine the other gouernment erre also of ignorance? Master Barrow, these poore shifts will not defend ye before God, but that ye haue intruded into his seate, vnlesse you haue surer ground that all her conuinced. For what if some should be conuinced in some matters, yet who they protest the contrary, who can iudge them but God? And now seeing it hath not been done by these, therefore it resteth onely vpon your selues, let vs come to see what you haue done. It cannot bee but you haue conuinced all, you haue opened so many matters. Yea but before your matters came to the sight and knowledge of the thousand man, (I might say almost to the sight of any) ye had abandoned and condemned all without any order. What a conuincing is this? And when they be come abroad (I meane your writings) though not vnto the hands of all, nor yet of the greater part, wee must vppon your bare word, contrary to our owne knowledge, admit many foule and false accusations, we must vpon your warrant allowe many fantasticall opinions, we must condemne all the Churches, and iustifie the Donatists and Annabaptists, or els we cannot be by you conuinced. Your outragious dealing being such, as almost hath not been seene, (which shall appeare by laying open somewhat of your bookes) and your grosse errors with palpable ignorance to be wondered at euen of the vnlearned, how shall wee thinke that God hath sent ye as it were great Apostles, to conuince and to reforme all? You say Christ hath sent ye, but in very

very neere Satan in the likenes of an Angell of light hath most miserably seduced ye. Ye say often that many in our Church haue been and are perswaded that there be many faults; and do not these then sinne against their conscience in as much as they ioyne still with it? Maste. Barrowit is a foule hereticall opinion to hold that a man may not ioyne with that Church which holdeth and maintaineth some faults and errors. Did the holy Apostles refuse to ioyne with the multitude in Ierusalem, which held the Ceremonies? Doth not S. Paule labour in diuers places to ioyne them together in peace, which in some matters brake and continued in diuers iudgement? Read the Rom. 14. and 15. for this poynt. Thus much might suffice to shewe your horrible and inexcusable presumption, contrary to the rules of Gods word, in condemning as quite separated from Christ, the whole Church in the land, all particular assemblies, and all seuerall persons both yong and old, men and women in the same, whom yet ye haue neuer seene, much lesse admonished and conuinced, but that your words which yet remayne vnrauthed (I meane of those which I set downe) do drawe me further.

There be three things yet remayning in your former words, in which ye erre foully, whereby all men shall see, how farre off ye are from making any iust defence of your vngodly presumption. And your selues shall knowe (if the Lord open your eares) that it is but a thicke couering of darknes and ignorance vnder which ye lye shrouded, and (as ye imagine) shielded from the sinne, and from the danger of intrusion into Gods office, when ye condemne as heathen and infidels all our assemblies. The first of the three and the second also are in these words, when ye say, and heresie in that man, or in that congregation that so holdeth & teacheth it, doth separate from the faith &c. Thus ye reason. If a man be in an error, and be vnduly conuinced, and found obstinate, so that he obstinately persist in and teach his error, euen against his conscience, wee may safely iudge that man to haue no faith, no communion with Christ. The same is to be sayd of a congregation, and so of the whole Church of England, and of all the assemblies therein, and of al particular members of the same, being all in one estate, and condition; that is to

say, duely convinced, and found obstinate. How farre we may proceed in iudging a man voyd of faith, for obstinacie, we shall see in the next place: here I begin with, and note how blindly and how absurdly in your consequence of being convinced, ye compare a Church and one man together. For a man erring, and his error reproued, either the whole man is convinced, and is obstinate, or els the whole man erreth still in ignorance. But it is farre otherwise in a visible Church, because in it, there bee sundry sorts of members, which may not be all founded up together under one sentence. For looke vpon the visible Church of Israel at such time as our Saviour was borne & liued vpon the earth, and we shall see there were in it excellent godly ones, as the blessed Virgin, the Father and mother of Iohn the Baptist, Anna the Prophetisse, olde Symeon, and many others. There were heapes of ignorant people called the lost sheepe of the house of Israel: Math. 10. And there were the Scribes and Pharisies, which held and taught obstinately, very wicked errors. It is hereby manifest, that sometime it commeth to passe, that in a visible Church there be which maintaine some errors, and it may be some of the convinced in their conscience (which yet is known for the most part but to God) there be that erre of ignorance and simplicitie, and there bee that allow the errors. Now what warrant is there to wrap up all these together vnder the same condemnation, and to say they be all separated from the faith and from the Communion of Christ?

The second error of the two is to bee obserued in this, that you say, obstinacie ioyned with error in a man convinced thereof in his conscience, doth separate from the faith, and from the communion of Christ. Which, to serue your turne against all our assemblies, must stand as I haue before set it downe. I take it for an vndoubted trueth, that where is no sound faith in that man which proudly and with a full contempt of God and his trueth doth obstinately euen convinced in his conscience, hold and teach an error. But yet (Master Barrow) if you will stand to maintayne that your speach, you must shake hands with Nouatus: for there be, as of other sinnes, the remnants yea foule remnants, of obstinacie and contempt of God and his trueth, in all the re-

generate and sanctified. Whereupon it commeth to passe, that as godly men doo fall into sundrie knowne sinnes, and willingly accroding to the flesh, yea sometime into the grosser, and do continue in them: which cannot be but with some wilfull obstinacie and contempt against God. As for examples, we have Samson that lived in fornication, David that did commit adulterie and murther, Solomon that fell into Idolatrie. These did knowe they sinned, and Nathan tolde David, *Thou hast despised the Lord, Thou hast despised the word of the Lord.* And also as it falleth out in some that have faith, that they fall into foule actions, and the remnants of obstinacie & wilfull contempt are so strong in them, and the worke of grace lyeth in them as it were so buryed, that they not onely despise private admonitions, but also for a time the iudgement and publike censure of the Church. As for example, the man which tooke his mother in law to be his wife, in the Church of Corinth. He did knowe euen by the light of nature that it was a foule sinne. And though the Church neglected to call him forth, yet many no doubt did blame him. Notwithstanding, he continued so obstinate, that when Saint Paule had decreed his excommunication, he was cast forth. This man in the time of his obstinacie had faith and was in Christ: as it appeareth by his repentance in the second Epistle, where Saint Paule willeth to receaue him in agayne. Euen so it commeth to passe in men regenerate, who erring in some opinions, which being reproued by the word of God, yet the remnants of obstinacie and froward contempt do make them either unwilling to see any thing agaynst that which they have once holden and maintayned, or if they do see, yet they will not yeeld. Now, as it is an hard thing for us to finde and knowe certainly that a man is convinced of an error in his conscience, (especially when it falleth out in lighter matters which are not so clearely discussed by the word) though another man see it (as hee thinketh) plainly: so also is it most ungodly and without any warrant of Gods word, to say (when one indeed is convinced and doth not yeeld) this man is separated from the faith and from the communion of Christ. For if great remnants of wilfull obstinacie, cannot bee in him that hath faith, then hee that wittingly and wil-

willingly (according to the flesh) falleth into a grosse sinne, is by and by separated from the communion of Christ. For if such contempt and wilfull rebellion agaynst God may stand one moneth, or one yeare with faith, what reason is there but that a man regenerate may lye in such securitie sundrie yeares, vntill the Lord vtterly driue him out of it? For God, as a father, doth chastise his children for their wilfull obstinacie, contempt, and rebellion, and bringeth them to repentance in his good time. Ye will say, if they repent, then ye acknowledge them to be in Christ, but while they repent not, how can a man be blamed for saying they haue no faith? You must know (Master Barrow) that a man is not in Christ because he doth repent, but he repenteth because he is in Christ. For the beginning and proceeding of repentance is all from Christ crucified, and onely vnto those that be in him. Rom. 6. 1. Pet. 4. 1, 2. Agayne, do not you know that he which is once lightened and hath imbraced the faith, if he sinne such a sinne as doth separate him from the faith, and from the communion of Christ, he can neuer be restored agayne by repentance? Then seeing there is no man but sinneth willingly, and continueth with some obstinacie in sundrie things, how can you maintaine this, that euery wilfull obstinacie in error doth separate from the faith, and from the communion of Christ, but that you must with Nouatus, cut all the regenerate from the hope of repentance, seeing all do transgresse of knowledge?

Your third error is in keeping the distinction of errors fundamentall and not fundamentall, where ye call it a papisticall distinction, and gather many absurdities, most foolishly in very deed, and not so much as to be repented, because they arise from your ignorance: for tell me Master Barrow, Christ being the foundation, vpon which all the faithfull as liuing stones are built, and grow together into a holy Temple: are there not errors, which if a man hold neuer so ignorantlie, he is not in Christ, hee holdeth not the foundation so long as hee erreth in them, he is not coupled with the liuing stones to make one building? And on the contrary, be there not errors which the faithfull doo erre in, and be in Christ? This you cannot denie, (vnlesse you will maintaine the heresie of perfection in the regenerate

rate, but you say that with wilfull obstinacie, the least error casteth a man out of Christ. Alas poore man, may not a childe see your follie? When ye confesse there be errors, that a man may erre and dye in, and yet hold Christ the foundation, and so be saued: is it not as much as to say there be errors that are not fundamentall? If a man be convinced in them, and hold them so obstinately, that he be thereby separated from Christ; It is not any of these errors which haue separated him (which ye confesse he may erre in, and yet haue faith) but his wicked obstinacy and contempt, in holding and teaching them against his conscience. Now therefore Master Barrow, and Master Greenewod, lay all those things together which I haue noted touching your confused ignorance, errors, and absurdities, and see whether yee haue brought any thing to cleere your selues from the fearefull and odious, yea most accursed presumption, by which yee take vpon ye to abandon and forsake, as vtterly separated from the faith, and from the Communion of Christ, all the assemblies of the Church of England, and all the particular members of the same, the a thicke couering of darkenes, which the bright countenance of the great Iudge will peerce through and scatter. Ye lye in prison, not as Christs poore afflicted seruants, but for this grieuous and outragious sinne, which no flesh is able to defend or mitigate, and for sundry other abuses, as shall appear by your bookes. I saide that the fearefull end of one Bolrom, about twentie yeares past, would not be forgotten. You haue heard (as you say, pag. 208) that he reuolted and became a conformable member of our Church, and so fel into that fearefull estate. Seeke better information Master Barrow, seeing the example may touch ye, for the truth is, he did for the same causes that you doo, vtterly condemne the whole Church of England, and was with sundry other separated from it. And (as it is constantly affirmed) he was an elder in their secret Church, and afterward falling into deepe dispaire, he could not be recouered, but did hang himselfe. The matter which pressed him so sore, was this, that he had iudged and condemned men better then himselfe. Looke yee therefore vnto it in time, and seeke repentance before the terror of God breake forth vpon ye, and that it

be

betolate; for it is euident vnto all that haue any true light in them, that your offence herein can haue no excuse or colour: beare not your selues vpon other things in your bookes, for it shall appeare, that where yee thinke your selues most deuine, there Satan hath most deepely deluded yee, glorie not of any sufferings, vnles yee will haue those also to glorie which are bound in bedlam.

Hauing thus finished about wilfull obstinacie, we come now to the fower principall accusations, which ye bring against our Church.

The first is that we worship God after a false manner: our worship being made of the inuention of man, euen of that man of sinne, erronious, and imposed vpon vs. And hereame the booke of common praier into question. I did drawe your accusation into a Sillogisme: and you accuse me to be so full of legier du main, that ye had neede to looke to up fingers, for ye say I haue left out certaine of your words, as namely these (wilfully obstinate, and imposed.) Touching these words, wilfully obstinate, looke Master Barrow in the fourth and fift pages of my booke, and see whether I did not answer them where you haue expressely set them downe; looke also vpon your owne booke now printed, and you shall finde, that both in the accusation you haue omitted these words (wilfully obstinate) and also passed by mine answer vnto them. Now when these two, that is, the omitting the words, and passing by the answer vnto them, doo concurre, here is a great shew of legier du maine on your part, and yet you would lay it vpon me, that haue not giuen the least suspition therof. And for the word imposed, you say I leaue it out, and put it in the place thereof. I doo indeede set downe it, for these words, erronious and imposed vpon them, but doo I leaue them out in handling the matter? Looke in the tenth page, and see whether I doo not charge ye with an Anabaptisticall freedome (which ye are not able to auoyde) for this worde imposed: Master Barrow looke vppon them, learne modestie, and blush, if not for conscience, yet that these things must now lie open to the view of the world.

And for the booke of common Praier, although the question

betweene

betweene vs, was not whether there bee faultes in it, but whether it be (as you tearme it) a great pregnant Idoll, full of heresies, blasphemies & abominations: whether there be any heresies in it: And whether the best part of it be none other but a peece of swines flesh, an abomination to the Lord? Yet you charge me as flying the trial by the word of God: when I stand to iustifie by the word of God, that in deede there is neither Idolatrie, heresie, nor blasphemie in it, much lesse that it is full of them, or the best part an abhomination. For in mine answers and defence, I doo not vndertake to cleare it of all faults (hauing no occasion to meddle in that controuersie) but to shew that there are no such faultes, but that both the faithfull people of God haue and may erre in, & also euen christian gouernours and teachers, which are to reforme the church, & that if any doo see and be perswaded that they be corruptions and faultes, yet not of that qualitie or degree, as that they may for the same separate themselues from the fellowship of those which are otherwise minded: this is the thing which I haue taken vpon mee to defend. And if you (Master Barrow) wil not become a ranke heretick, (as if it please God you shall not) to maintaine this opinion, that we may not ioyne in that worship, where wee finde any imperfections and errors holden, and not reformed: why doo you with wonderment crie out, that this so large an exception of imperfections, is the odde and onely exception that euer you heard of. And doo you in very deede Master Barrow thinke that no such exception is to bee made, but that where any error doth appeare in the worship, a man is to separate himselfe? Nay you will say when it is reproued and continued in, and not reformed, then a man is to forsake that Church as vtterly fallen from the couenant of God. For they be obstinate and denie reformation.

Tell me then, what if those that be to reforme, be perswaded it is no error? What if a great part of the multitude be so perswaded, that it is no fault, and so bee of diuerse mindes? Will you deeme that you haue more skill to conuince them, then the Apostles had? Or will you refuse to ioyne, as the Apostles did ioyne with the Church in Ierusalem, that held and continued in a grosse error? Doo you not see how by this your doctrine, you

giue

open the doore as wide vnto all Schismaticks, as euer did the Donatists or the Anabaptists, seeing there will euer be errors, and some that cannot be made to see them: Will you not see how you contrarie Saint Paule directly, who in whole chapters almost (as I haue noted before) dooth labour nothing else but to perswade the Christians that held diuers opinions touching some things in Gods worship, yet to ioyne together: Rom. 14. and 15. what a multitude of words, with your accustomed reuilings and slanders haue you here heaped vp? But I will deale onely with that which is not answered alreadie.

You charged our Church with Romish fasts. I charged you with falie accusing: because the Church of Rome, most wickedly against the Crosse of Christ, placeth the worship of God, and the merite of eternall life in fasting, which doctrine our Church vtterly condemneth. You labour to shew faultes in our fasts, what is that now to the purpose? And so in diuers other things, is this the question betweene vs?

You charge vs with idoll feastes, as if wee worshipped Saints and Angels. I told you it is a starke lie, and so I must affirme, our Church vtterly condemning all that most blasphemous doctrine of popery, touching the meditation of Saints or Angels: here againe you deale but euen as in the former, you must not still so boldly slander, but proue that the dayes are kept in honour of the Saints and Angels. And so for the naming of the Churches. I knowe Saint Luke did not in any respect honour Mars: and so did not contrarie to that which Dauid professeth, saying he would not take the names in his mouth: you may see by his example, how Dauid is to be vnderstoode, not of the very naming, but of the naming with some honor, for a man may name them either in detestation, or as Saint Luke dooth onely to make destinction.

Then come tithes and oblations: here in deede Master Barrow you bid me looke whether this error be not fundamentall, being obstinately held, and lying for your reason, that they which reuiue any part of the ceremoniall lawe are bound to the whole lawe, and so are (as Paule saith to the Galathians) abolished from Christ. Truely Master Barrow, the more I reade

of

of your writings, the more I pitie your blindnes.

I could not haue beene perswaded, that you were so exceeding ignorant, taking vpon you to controule all Churches, and farre to excell all the most learned deuines: neither could it enter into my thought, that any would so boldly abuse the holy Scriptures, to seduce and subuert the mindes of simple men. I doo here also intreate the reader to be attentiue a little, and to see vpon what foundation you doo builde a great part of your dooings. For here to proue the paying of tithes an error fundamentall, and vtterly to separate from Christ being obstinately held: you alleage the words of Saint Paule, Galath. 5. I testifie againe vnto euery man which is circũcised, that he is debtor to keepe the whole lawe: yee are abolished from Christ, &c. Let me first aske ye then, were the fathers which were circumcised in the time of ꝑ law, abolished from Christ, and fallen from grace? You will say no, for circumcision was a seale of the righteousnes of faith, Rom. 4. Then it must needes be graunted that Saint Paule doth not speak here of circumcisiõ in the right vse, for which God did ordeine it, for so it was not cõtrary vnto Christ, albeit the retaining of it after Christ come, was an error. Also let me aske ye further, doo you thinke that Saint Paule was contrarie to himselfe, when he circumcised Timothie, Acts 16. ver. 3. Or after that, when he would with those which had a vow be purified, and offer an oblation according to the lawe? Act. 21. 26. will you say that Saint Paule and Timothie became debtors to keepe the whole lawe? Or that they were abolished from Christ? It is horror to admit any thought that way, or once to make doubt of such a matter. Neither would Iames and the other Apostles haue suffered or tolerated the Church in Ierusalem, in that which doth abolish from Christ. Whereupon it followeth of necessity, that Saint Paule here to the Galathians, doth not speake simply of the ceremonie of circumcision: but as it was vrged with the doctrine of the false Apostles, which was this, that circumcision was a necessary part of Gods worship, and that men could not bee saued vnles they were circumcised: for so did the false Apostles vrge it, as ye may see, Act. 15. 1. placing righteousnes and the

merite of eternall life in it, for against that Saint Paule speaketh here to the Galathians, saying, as many as are iustified by the lawe, are abolished from Christ, & fallen from grace. Here is the thing then, that the false Apostles did ioyne the law and Christ together for iustification: and Saint Paule testifieth and denounceth, that he which is circumcised with such a minde, as to be iustified in part thereby, hee is debtor to keepe the whole law, which is not possible for any flesh, and therefore he shall stand vnder the curse. Moreouer he is abolished from Christ, and fallen from grace, because the iustification by grace, and the iustification by the law, are so contrarie, that they cannot be ioyned together: he that will holde any thing of the one, must forgoe the other. This being the thing which Saint Paule speaketh of the Galathians, and not the very ceremonies which both he and Timothie did sometime obserue, nor yet the error of the Church of Ieruſalem, which was not to place the worship of God and righteousnesse in them (which the holy Apostles would neuer haue borne withall, seeing it ouerthroweth the faith of Christ) marke well Master Barrowe (or if you will be wilfull let others marke) how foolishly, and yet with what furious terror, ye thunder out the abolishing from Christ, for paying tithes, and for the obseruation of some ceremonies, in which, if there be a fault, it is so farre from that which the false Apostles went about to seduce the Galathians in, that it commeth short of the error of the Church of Ieruſalem. For the Church of England (as all men may see) doth condemne fully and absolutely, not onely that doctrine of the false Apostles, and of the Church of Rome, touching iustification or merite of woords, but also teacheth the whole law of ceremonies was to cease, now Christ being come. Cease therefore Master Barrow this foolish rage, and labour not to seduce the people, deceiuing, and being deceiued, as the blessed Apostle speaketh. *Ye obserue dayes and times, months, and yeares* (saith Saint Paule to the Galathians) *I am afraide of ye, least I haue laboured among ye in vaine. If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit ye nothing.*

The Church of England (say you) obserueth dayes and times, as Easter, Whitsonday, &c. and payeth tithes, and obserueth

ſerueth other ceremonies, therefore Chriſt can profit yee nothing, ye are abolished from Chriſt, ye are fallen from the conenant of grace, in as much as ye obſtinately holde and continue in them.

Is it not much to bee lamented, that after ſo many yeares preaching of the Goſpell, much people ſhould lie open to bee ſpoyled by ſuch poore ſeely ſtuffe as this, and bee led away by ſuch more then ſottiſh ignorance? Cannot men ſee that the whole matter lieth in the diuers endes of obſeruation? The falſe Apoſtls, the Church in Ieruſalem, Paul and Timothy, doo obſerue the ſelfe ſame things, that is Circumciſion and other ceremonies of the lawe: The falſe Apoſtles are abolished from Chriſt, as they vrge and obſerue them: The Church of Ieruſalem is not abolished from Chriſt, but yet erreth groſely, Saint Paul and Timothie ſinne not at all thereby. What is the reaſon of this difference, but that as ye may ſee, the falſe Apoſtles obſerued and vrged the ceremonies as meritorious for iuſtification, and therefore the Epiſtle to the Galathians is ſpent in declaring the righteouſnes by fayth, and ouerthrowing the righteouſnes by the law. The Church in Ieruſalem obſerued the ceremonies not placing righteouſnes in them, but to the end that God had ordayned them, to ſhadow out heauenly things, being ignorant in this that they were ordayned but vnto the time of correction, as the holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh, Hebr. 9. And therfore in that Epiſtle to the Hebrues there is no charging or blaming of them, touching the matter of iuſtification, but onely a reducing of them from that foreſayd error in which they did ſtick ſo long. When Saint Paule ſpeaketh of obſeruing the ceremonies, which was but at ſometimes, as occaſion fell out, hee is ſo farre from deeming it a fault, that hee reckoneth it among his vertues: and ſayth, *to thoſe that are vnder the lawe, I became as if I were vnder the law, that I might win thoſe that are vnder the law.* 1. Cor. 9. The Synagogue of Antichriſt in more haynous and deteſtable manner then the falſe Apoſtles, againſt the Croſſe of Chriſt, euen againſt the righteouſnes by fayth in his blood, obſerue dayes and times, and a number of ceremonies of their owne inuention, by which they ſeeke remiſſion of ſinnes,

and the merite of eternall life. Our Church doth renounce and accurse all such doctrine, neither doe we maintaine any Iudaisme. And touching the paying of tithes, (that I may conclude this poynt) if I say there might bee somewhat morall in it, though it were annexed to the Leuiticall Priesthood, I doe not see how you shall be able to disproue the same.

In the visitation of the sick, there is a forme of absolution set downe. Thus you (Master Barrow) write agaynst it: Let the Reader vnderstand, that nothing can be more popish and blasphemous then it is: wherein a sacrilegious priest taketh vpon him, by the authoritie committed vnto him, to absolue the sick from all his sinnes. Hath any mortall man power to forgiue sinnes? Or is it not the office of God alone? Hath the priest power to forgiue all sinnes, such as are not made vnto him? what horrible blasphemie is this? to him that hath power to forgiue all sinnes, to him we may make our prayers and supplications, him onely may we worship. Hath the greatest minister of the Church any more power to retayne or loose the sinne of the least member, then the sayd member hath to binde or loose his sinne? Doth not this rule of our Sauiour Christ, as well extend vnto him as vnto the least in the Church, *If thy brother sinne agaynst thee, rebuke him, and if hee repent, forgiue him?* Luke. 17. 3. Hath not the Church! power to reproue and cast out their Pastor if he deserue? Is not all this binding and loosing done by the worde of God, and not by any power or excellencie of man? Hath not the word of God the like power and effect against sinne in the mouth of the least of Gods seruants, as in the mouth of the greatest? Let this collect then (whereby the priest in their leiturgie by the power committed to him absolueth the sick of all his sinnes) remaine one witnes (among many other) of their popery, and vntill more come of most high blasphemie.

Thus farre be your wordes Master Barrow. Then this absolution (you say) nothing can be more popish or blasphemous, you cry out at it as horrible blasphemie: And will haue this collect remaine as one witnes of most high blasphemie. If it be so, I haue done you great wrong by charging you as false accusers

accusers: But in very deede while you go about to make ỹ Reader vnderstãd that nothing can be more popish or blasphemous, yea, that it is horrible and most high blaspemie, you bewray so darke ignorance and confusion, as I think wee may tearme deepe & horrible, as shal appeare by the reasons you bring. But now for this absolution, take this by the way, that I doo not vndertake to dispute vpon, or to iustifie euery circumstance thereof, as namely the vndiscreet and vnskilfull dealing of some that may practize it; but onely deale about the substance of the matter it selfe, against which your reasons are brought, to proove it to be popery and blasphemie.

You aske first, Hath any mortall man power to forgiue sinnes? or whether it be not Gods office alone? Why Master Barrow, will you denie that mortall men haue power to forgiue sinnes? doth not our Sauiour Christ say vnto his Apostles, *Whose sinnes ye shall forgiue, they are forgiuen, and whose sins ye shall retayne, they are retayned?* Ioh. 20. ver. 23. Dare you contradict the flat testimonie of the scripture? And for your other question, it is most certayne, and the contrary cannot bee held without blasphemie and sacrilege, that God onely hath power and authority to forgiue sinnes, if we respect the author of forgiuenes: And men doo but in his name, and from him as ministers, bring the same vnto vs. If wee respect the thing it selfe, it is peculiar vnto the most high God: but the ministrie is his hand, by which he reacheth it foorth vnto vs, and therefore they bringing the message and word of reconciliation, are adorned with this title, that they forgiue, and retayne sinnes: yet al is but instrumentall. It is most vndoubted that God alone doth beget his Children by the immortall seede of his worde: And yet Saint Paul sayth to the Corinthians, that he was their Father, and that he begat them. All this is but ministeriall, God is robbed of no honour.

You demaund, whether the priest hath power to forgiue all sinnes, such as are not made vnto him? I answere that the minister of the Gospel, is the minister of reconciliation, (I meane to bring it) and hath power to forgiue all sinnes annexed to his ministrie, or rather it is the fruite and effect and power of his ministrie,

ministrie, in deliuering the promises. You seeme to speake of forgiuing of trespasses which are done against our selues, which declareth also your want of skill: as namely that you know not what this is, whose sinnes ye shall forgiue, they that are forgiuen. We may make our prayers vnto him, & worship him only, that hath power to forgiue all sinnes. This is true, if we looke to the author of this grace, which is God alone: But not when we looke to those which are but ministers, and the earthen vessels in which this treasure is brought.

You aske, whether the greatest minister in the Church, hath anie more power to retayne or loose the sinne of the least member, then the sayd member hath to binde or loose his sinnes? And then you bring certaine reasons to proove that he hath not any more power then the least member. Is it not a straunge thing (Master Barrow) that such geare should come from you? will you take away the whole efficacie and power of the ministrie which Christ hath ordayned? By the ministers of the Gospell (as I sayd before) God sendeth the word of reconciliation, they be his hand, by which he doth reach it foorth vnto vs: when they preach the glad tidings, or deliuer the promise of free pardon vnto all that shall beleeue in Christ crucified, and deliuer the seales of the doctrine, euen Baptisme and the holy Supper: God doth accompanie the ministration of these things, by his spirit, & so doth ratifie the same. For which cause the ministrie of the Gospell is called the ministrie of the spirit. 2. Cor. 3. The spirit of the Lord giueth vs our freedome by losing the bonds of our sinnes, when through faith wee lay hold of the promise. And hee that beleeueth not is still bound. Then when Christ sayth, *Whose sinnes ye shall forgiue, they are forgiuen, and whose sinnes ye shall retaine, they are retained.* This is the sense, that to those whom God doth send (publishing the Gospell, and setting to the seales in those which imbrace it, and so bringing free pardon of sinnes) he doth communicate this honour which belongeth to himselfe, that they are sayd to forgiue sinnes.

As I sayd before, he giueth away nothing herein from himselfe, because it is not giuen vnto them as to the authors of the

pardon,

pardon, but as to the instruments and ministers, by whome hee doth reach it foorth, as by his hand, and by whose ministrie hee doth ratifie ẏ same vnto vs. Likewise whē they denounce iudgment agaynst the impenitent, he doth confirme it. What do you tell vs then of that rule of admonishing and pardoning? Luk. 17. These be things differing. It is also very true that the power of binding and losing is wholly from the word, not depending vpon the excellencie of any man: and that the dignitie and power of the word (if wee respect it in it selfe) is all one, out of whose mouth so euer. But yet (Master Barrow) you should knowe, that it is Gods ordinance and good pleasure, to giue a special operation and power vnto it by the ministrie. Baptisme doth seale vp the forgiuenes of our sinnes, and hath he not ordayned, that this seale shalbe set to by ẏ ministry? I would you saw how bold your ignorāce hath made you, euen agaynst Gods ordinance, as to giue no more efficacie vnto the word in the mouth of the most excellent minister, then in the mouth of any true Christian.

Your other demaund is to no purpose, seeing nothing dooth binde or lose, but onely the word, and the binding or losing by men, is no more, but when men by authoritie from God, in a ministrie which hee dooth ratifie, pronounce remission of sinnes or iudgement, rightly according to the word, as the word pronounceth. Shall we then beleeue, that euery true Christian hath the same and equall power of binding and loosing that Paule or Peter had? You say so, and would prowe it, and not onely haue here set downe your blinde reasons, but in your other booke (which you entitle a briefe discouerie of the false Church) and in the page 124. You say that by the place *Iohn 20.* wee cannot prooue this power of binding and loosing to bee giuen onely to the Apostles, there being many disciples both men and women in the place when Christ gaue it. This appearing indeed of our Sauiour was the same day at night in which hee rose from the dead, as the Euangelists do expressely declare. It is plaine also by S. Luke 24. 33. that there were some other with the Apostles when he appeared vnto them. But yet (Master Barrow) consider the place well, and if there be any forehead remayning, it will make you blush a little at your owne bolde speach, when

you say that to challenge the power of binding and losing, as giuen or annexed to the ministrie, by these words, *Whose sinnes ye remit, &c.* is by an old worthles title. For was the Commission of the Apostleship giuen vnto all that were there, both men and women? Because you say; There were both men and women there besides the Apostles, and that he gaue the power of binding and loosing vnto them all alike: and sayd vnto them all, whose sinnes ye shall remit, they are remitted. &c.

Marke all his words together. Againe, *Peace be with ye, as the father hath sent me, so I send you. And when he had said this, he breathed vpon them, and sayd, receaue the holy Ghost. Whose sinnes ye shall remit, they are remitted, and whose sinnes ye shall retaine, they are retained.* Did he say to all there present, yea euen to the women, as the father hath sent me, so I send you? I pray ye whether sent he the women vpon that message vpon which he was sent by the father? These former words are onely to the Apostles vpon whome hee layeth the charge, or the ambassage which his father had committed vnto him. As Paule 2. Cor. 5. declareth that the Apostles were Ambassadors from GOD in Christs stead. If you will shame then to say that Christ layd the charge which the father committed to him vpon the women (as you say there were some women there, and it is not vnlike) or if you dare not affirme that the women are sent vpon this ambassage to be Apostles, which is in these former words, as the father sent me, so I send you, how dare you say the latter words are spoken vnto all? For to those onely he sayth, *receaue the holy Ghost: whose sinnes ye shall remit, they are remitted.* To whom he had sayd, *As the father hath sent me so I send you.* And tell me Master Barrow, is there not some part of this power of losing or remitting sinnes by the Sacraments? I meane, doe not the Sacraments effectually seale vnto vs the remission of sinnes? And is that power committed to any but Ministers? Hath God giuen a power to the Ministers aboue other to set to the seales, and no power aboue others in deliuering the word of the couenant which is sealed? It is no meruaile that you dare goe about to ouerthrowe all the power of the Ministrie of the Gospell (which Saint Paule setteth forth to be so glorious,

2. Cor.

2.Cor.3.) in affirming that the greatest Minister hath no more power to binde the least member, then the sayd member hath to binde him: when you are thus grossly ignorant, as to affirme that our Sauiour spake those words vnto women, *Whose sinnes ye shall forgiue. &c.* Ioh.20. and see not that God hath ratified a power of deliuering the word and Sacraments by a ministrie, which hee vseth as his hand reached foorth vnto vs. They that will further and more fully see into this wicked error of yours, must looke vpon that which the learned haue written against the Swinckfeldians, about the same.

And now (Master Barrow) to come to the very poynt indeed that is in controuersie betweene you and me. I wished that you were as weary of lying and slandering, as you should bee in seeking vntill you should finde one blasphemie or heresie in all the Collects of the booke: and therefore you haue here gathered together a whole packe. You tell me first, that I haue in remembrance the Collect wherein the Priest by the authoritie committed vnto him, doth absolue the sick of all his sinnes. Indeed you tolde vs that this is most high blasphemie, and that nothing can be more popish. But learne you Master Barrow, by the Scripture, and remember that God hath giuen a power to the ministrie of the Gospell to forgiue sinnes. The power indeede is but ministeriall, and so the booke it selfe declareth, where it sayth: *He hath giuen power and commandement to his ministers, to declare and pronounce to his people being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sinnes.* Other power in the minister to forgiue sinnes then this, the booke alloweth none. How the Pope doth challenge this power to himselfe as head, and how from him it must be deriued vnto all Ministers, how farre also he hath extended it, and how horribly and blasphemously he hath abused it, I will not stand to shewe.

Then next, you say, I must not forget the two Collects sayd ouer our dead brother. The one in which we say that God of his mercie hath taken away the soule of our brother, &c. This is not ment but where the partie dieth in the profession of the faith and repentance, nor yet absolutely to pronounce him saued, but in a charitable manner of speach to iudge of him as he professed. I

do not take it the meaning of the booke, that it should be vttered of such as make no profession of the holy faith, (for why then should he be called a brother?) or vpon whome God doth shewe his fearefull iudgement, if it be otherwise, it may be a fault, but not blasphemie.

The other is, that we pray for the soule of our brother departed: where we say, that wee with this our brother and all other departed in the true faith, may haue our perfect consummation and blisse both in body and soule. Prayer for the dead is a grosse error, but yet not simply in it selfe an heresie, or blasphemie, and our Church dooth vtterly condemne it as a grosse error. And therefore Master Barrow, you do still but helpe the booke, which directeth herein to pray onely for our selues liuing, and not for the dead. For if the mention of receiuing blisse with that brother departed, were to pray for him, then should it be meant that wee would also pray for the soules of Abraham, Isaack and Iaakob, of the Prophets and Apostles, because they are included, in these words, with all other departed in the true faith.

In the third place you are so kinde, that as you say, to helpe my memorie a little further, you will mee to consider better of that glorious Anthem which wee say at our Communion, that we with Angels and Archangels and all the companie of heauen lawd and magnifie. &c. Here you will not demaund how wee remaining in the flesh, can haue such familiar conuersation with those heauenly Souldiers, that together with them wee can praise God. You will not demaund, (that is, you do in a fine rethoricall sort demaund it) but the finenes of this rethoricke will not cover the sottishnes of your ignorance. For albeit men in earth haue not familiar conuersation with Angels, yet they praise God together with them, in as much as both men and Angels do lawd and magnifie him. And therefore the Prophet Psal. 103. calling vpon all things to praise the Lord, toyneth the Angels, saying: *Praise the Lord ye Angels which are strong in power.* Reade also for this, the first chapter of the Reuel verl. 12, 13, 14. Then you will not presse vs with papisticall speculations of making degrees of Angels and Archangels, &c. In very deede you cannot but with falsehood presse our Church with

that.

that. But you demaund how many Archangels we reade of and finde in the Scriptures, and whether wee knowe of any more heads of Angels then Christ himselfe?

We knowe and constantly professe that there is but one head of Angels which is Christ. And we condemne the popish curiositie in searching into the degrees and orders of Angels, which is not learned out of the holy Scriptures, but from that counterfeit Dionisius Areopagita. And if that Michael the Archangel which stroue with the diuell about the body of Moses, and durst not giue rayling sentence were Christ: yet S. Paule speaketh of an Archangell besides Christ, when he sayth: *The Lord himself shal come downe from heauen with the voyce of the Archangell, and with the trumpe of God.* 1. Thess 4. vers. 16. What blasphemie then (Master Barrow) is there in the booke, which speaketh but as the Scripture, and you may see plainly that, to be a chiefe Angell, or an Archangell, is not to be the head of Angels? The sanctifying the floud Iordain, and all other waters to the mysticall washing away of sinne, is none other way to be taken, then to say that bread and wine are sanctified to represent the body and bloud of Christ. All the creatures of God are sanctified to our vse, as the blessed Apostle speaketh.

Touching Michael and all Angels, we do not worship Angels, nor yet make Christ a creature. You say that in the Letanie, there is prayer for all that trauaile by sea or by land, for all that be sicke, for all sicke persons: therefore we pray for Gods enemies, for the breach of all order, and destruction both of Church and common wealth. This is but a vayne collection, when prayer is intended for such as are prayed for, that they may be turned from their euill. Also when this word all is vsed, it goeth with this restraint, all that belong vnto God, for so is Saint Paule to be also restrayned vnto all sorts of men which belong vnto God, when he willeth to pray for al men. 1. Tim. 2.

You demaund where wee learne to pray agaynst lightning and thunder, tempest, plague, famine, battaile, &c. when there is no present feare or danger thereof?

Then it semeth by your words that wee may intreate the Lord to turne away none of his grieuous and fearefull plagues,

but when they be vpon vs? We sée there are euer anon some which are stricken with thunder: and when the clap is past, it is too late to pray for them. Againe, the praiers of the Church are for all the true members thereof whersoeuer: and if wee our selues bee not in this present neede, yet others are, and wée may be, if God turne not away his displeasure: these praiers are not to restraine the Lord the vse of his creatures, or that he should not by them destroy his enemies, these bee no sound collections. Unles you will argue thus, the Lord afflicteth his Church by persecutions, by famine and pestilence, &c. for their good, and for the glory of his owne name: therefore the church ought not to pray to be deliuered from those things. Wée are willed to be alwaies ready for death, and suddaine death cannot preuent any one of the faithfull I doo confesse. But yet wée estéme it a great comfort & a great blessing for sundry respects to be warned before, when wée shall depart out of this world, and a thing which we couet, and I sée no reason why we may not, for such respects craue it of the Lord. You would make men beléeue that we coniure Christ by his incarnation, by his natiuitie, baptisme, fasting and temptation, by his agony and bloudy sweat, by his Crosse and passion, &c. When we pray to be deliuered by them, hath not our Sauiour done these things for our deliuerance? And did he not deliuer vs by them? What blasphemie, heresie, or coniuration is there then in this praier, as to say deliuer vs by thy precious death and passion? You aske where we learned to pray for our forefathers offences? I answer that wée reade that the Lord will visit the sinnes of the Fathers vpon the Children: and therefore we desire the Lord not to remember the sinnes of the forefathers, to bring punishmẽt vpõ vs. It is a blinde collection whẽ any gather hereby that we pray for the dead, that their sinnes may be forgiuen them. These then bée the blasphemies and heresies which you Master Barrow doo accuse the booke of, to shew that you did not lye and slander: but how well you haue acquit your selfe, let all those iudge which haue any sobrietie. And now touching this that you did affirme the best part of the booke to be but as a péece of swines flesh, and abomination to the Lord: you goe about to de-

fend

kend your wicked spæch by the abuse, which I told you before could be none answer: for the things are holy in themselues, although conturers and Papists abuse them neuer so much. Touching the Lords Praier, we deale about it in the questiō of read praier. For the articles of the faith, you wold know what profe by Scripture we can make for that blasphemous Article, that Christ descended into hell? Also in your other booke page 76. these be your words; Their forged patcherie, commonly called the Apostles Creede or Symbole, Athanasius Creede, the Nycen Creede. Let the world iudge what cause you haue to glory in your sufferings: and whether ye be not liker Rabsaka, (who boasted also that God sent him against Ierusalem) then any of the holy Martyrs of Christ. Is there any Christian eare but will abhorre this beastly spæch, when you terme the Articles of our faith, a forged patchery? And doo you not I say, euen as a very Rabsaka most wickedly reproach all Churches, both of old and in these dayes. Athanasius Cræd, which is the Nycen Cræd is drawne from the word? It is the summe of the most glorious faith, concerning the blessed Trinitie, and some other Articles, which all true Churches and Christians haue euer professed, and doo professe. And for the Apostles Cræde, if it were not in the time of the Apostles, yet was it presently after, that confession or profession of the faith, which euery one of peres made, which was admitted to receaue the holy baptisme.

It is euery part drawne expressely out of the sacred writings of the Prophets and Apostles. And for that one article of Christs descending into hell, it is not blasphemous, nor yet hath in it any error, vnlesse it be misunderstoode. The Papists are very grosse in it, and fabulous, touching his descending to fetch out the soules of the patriarches. Others doo hold that our Sauiour in soule after his passion descended into hell, though to no such purpose: this is not blasphemie nor heresie. The place of Scripture which seemeth to warrant that his soule descended into hell, is in Psalme 16. Thou shalt not leaue my soule in hell, neither shalt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. *Scheol* doth signifie both hell and the graue, and in this place (say they which hold that his soule descended) it must needes be

taken

taken for hell, because the soule goeth not into the graue. Yet because Nephesh may be diuersely taken, as it is vsed sundrie times in Moses for the dead bodie, as also that it dooth signifie the vitall spirit, and so it is no absurditie to say after a manner of speech, that the life is shut vp in the graue so long as the body remaineth there: hereupon some doo expounde these words, he descended into hell, to be no more but thus, hee went downe into the graue. And whereas the order of the articles seemeth to ouerthrowe this exposition, because it is said, he was dead, buried, and descended into hell: they expound this clause, (he was buried) he was inbaulmed, as it is said when the woman powred the precious ointment vpon him, that she did it to burie him, Matth. 26. Nicodemus brought Mirre and Aloes: this dressing of the dead body, say they, was of the Iewes called buriall: and the putting into the graue, descending into hell. Others doo take it, that descending into hell is meant, that he remained in the state of the dead. Others that in his soule while he was vpon the Crosse, he suffered the torments of hell, as it is most certaine he did. Now Master Barrow, seeing the words be in the Scripture (thou shalt not leaue my soule in hell) and the matter resteth onely vpon the exposition, what immodest and intemperate heat, or rather furiouse outrage is this, to crie out of a blasphemous article, and to terme the articles of our faith, our forged patcherie?

Also for singing of Psalmes, I will note here vnto the reader, your soule prophane speeches: in page 180. thus you write. Heere would not bee forgotten also the sweete Psalmodicall harmonie of the Vultures, Crowes, Gleads, Owles, Geese, of the Leopards, Beares, Wolues, Dogs, Foxes, Swine, Goates, (pardon mee, for thus the holy Ghost termeth and likeneth the prophane multitudes assembled in the false Church) all these together with one accord simphonie and harmonie, sing some pleasant Ballad, or else vnto Dauids melodious harpe some Psalme in rime (I say not rithme now or meeter) well concinnate to the eare (though neuer a whit to the sence, purpose, or true vse of the Psalme) before the sermon, to stir vp the spirit of their worthy priest or preachers: who

being

being rapt and rauiſhed with this harmony goes to his geere, informe aboue ſaid, where his mouth diſtilles, and his lippes droppe ſuch old parables, ſuch premeditat and well ſtudied and choſen ſentences, as ſhall diſpleaſe no partie, vnles he be of too ſuſpitious a nature.

Your owne words Maſter Barrow, which I haue ſet downe, doo ſhew themſelues ſo vngodly and prophane vnto euery Chriſtian minde, yea vnto euery one which hath but a ſparke of humane ciuility and modeſty left in him, that I needz not to ſay much: for albeit our Sauiour called the Scribes and Phariſies, which were ſworne enemies vnto the Goſpell, and ſought by their counterfait holines to ſeduce others, generations of vipers and ſerpents: Herod that fore, and Saint Paule, called the falſe Apoſtles dogs: yet is it no excuſe or colour, for your prophane impiety, againſt all degrees and ſorts, both of men and women, which are no ſuch enemies, but loue and imbrace the Goſpell, when you giue them the names of thoſe vile beaſts and birds: and eſpecially when as this your moſt vile reproach, reacheth not alone vnto all the aſſemblies in England, but alſo vnto all the holy Churches which haue imbraced & profeſſe the glorious Goſpell. For all the Churches haue the Pſalmes in meeter, which they ſing in their publick aſſemblies, and their preſcribed leiturgies, which ye make ſo horrible. Moreouer, the people in other Churches, you make to be but prophane multitudes, as in the aſſemblies of England, as we ſhall afterwards ſee where you charge maſter Caluine at Geneua, that with ignorance and rathnes, and diſorderly proceedings, hee at the firſt dash maye no ſcruple to tereaue all the whole ſtate, euen all the prophane ignorant people, into the boſome of the church, which you terme a confuſe route, &c. A pernicious example vnto all Europe: whome then haue you called Wolues, Foxes, Dogs, Dwles, &c? Your tongs are your own, who is Lord ouer yee? Pſalm. 12. Your ſufferings are for Chriſt, ſo are theirs which lye bound in bedlem. I doo not doubt but that in ſundry places the Pſalmes in Metre ſtille of the ſtrict ſence, & ſo no doubt do their Pſalmes in any Church, but yet there is nothing in them vnholy, or diſagreeing from the truth. All the knowledge which

you haue is wholly from the writings, expositions, and translations of those whom you terme Owles, Vultures, Dogs, Foxes, &c. For take away the translations of the Bible, and what could you haue ſaid? And where had you the direction vnto the ſight of thoſe things which you hold in truth, but from the writings of others? Would you make vs beleeue that you had found them out of your ſelues? Indeede your vnſound and craſed principles, vpon which you ground are your own, and nothing elſe. And yet as if you had all knowledge in the fountaines of the holy Scriptures, and knew a right ſenſe and ſcope in them, which none beſides your ſelues haue attained vnto, you reprehend the Plaines as well concinnate to the eare, but nothing to the ſenſe, and alſo the preachers, as not rightly deuiding the word. If you had ſhewed ſome one Plaine for an example, firſt in laying open the naciue ſenſe (wherein yet for all your great braggs, you muſt truſt Tremellius, becauſe ſome one word wrong tranſlated may carry the ſenſe another way) and then how the matter hath wholly ſwarued from the ſame, it had been ſomewhat. If you haue any true grammer ſenſe of the Plaines (for that is it which we eſteeme as the ground of truth) or of the reſt of the Scriptures, which you haue not from ſuch Owles and Foxes, as Maſter Tremellious', Beza, and other tranſlators, we would be glad to know it. But remember what is ſaid of ſome, that they are ſwelling waues of the ſea, foming out their owne ſhame: what greater ſhame and diſcredit can there be then for men to fall into ſuch inſolency and ſwelling, that being groſſy ignorant, & hauing no knowledge but through the helpes miniſtred by others, yet take vpon them as if they were ſent from heauen, as the onely men that haue ſeene the true light? This is no exceſſiue ſpeech, ſeeing ye daterly in many things condemne all Churches and their learned Preachers: let the reader conſider of the prophanenes and falſehoode of your other ſpeeches, of the preacher going to his gere, and not offending any, and ſuch like. I doo not know Maſter Barrow, what your former conuerſation hath been: but by your ſpeeches a man would iudge that you had ſpent your time rather in the ſocieties of carding and dicing, then in the ſchoole of Chriſt, here

thereſore

therefore I conclude that with ignorance, falshood and prophane impiety, ye accuse our worship to be blasphemous and Idolatrous. Thus much for the first transgression, now to the second.

The second is that the prophane vngodly multitudes without exception of any one person, are with vs receiued into, and retained in the bosome and bodie of our Church.

In your preamble Master Barrow you doo but babble, and that vpon your owne surmises, contrarie to my plaine words, and whether against your conscience looke you; for I doo not allow euill ministers, nor their admitting of open notorious sinners vnto the table of the Lord. And when I saie the Church of England dooth not allow the same, I speake of the established publick order by the consent of the whole land, which is both for the godlines of the ministers, & repelling the notorious offendors from the Sacrament.

Moreouer, we doo not at any hand allow your arguments, which are drawne from the principles of Donatisme, as namely that we must separate our selues where we see any swarue from their vnety, and offend.

The reason which you brought to proue this second transgression (as you sayd) at once, I reduced into forme of Sylogisme thus: where all are receiued in by baptisme, and no power to cast forth any by excommunication, there all the prophane multitudes are, without exception of any one person receiued into, & retayned in the bosome and bodie of the Church. But in the Church of England all are receiued in by Baptisme, and no power to cast forth any by excommunication. Therefore in the Church of England all the prophane multitudes without the exception of any one person, are receiued into and retained in the bosome and bodie of the Church.

Here you complayne and that grieuously, that I dig frame this argument after mine owne conceipt, as I might best deale withall, and then did procede to confute you. The falsification which you charge me so sore withall is, that I haue put in a newe *minor* proposition: as namely the whole bodie of the Church of England, for the particular assemblies. It is a strange

case to see the voice of some man, what great [illegible] hee can contriue, if men will giue credit. He that is [illegible]icated whether it be by some one assemblie which ha[illegible]power, or by the whole bodie of a Church in a kingdom, is [illegible]e not cast forth: Did not Esra with the Princes and Elders of Israel, publish a Proclamation, that hee that should not come vp to Ierusalem within three dayes, should bee separated from the congregation of the multitude that came out of captiuitie: Esra.10.ver.8. this was excommunication. Moreouer, where you sayd, that the Parson and his parish hath not the power to cast forth any by excommunication. I did not let this passe, but tolde you, that it is not meete that the Parson and his parish should haue this power to excommunicate, vnlesse it be such a parish as hath the consistory of Pastors and Elders. I gaue you the example of the Church of Geneua, where euery seuerall flock hath a Pastor: but yet these Pastors and their flocks haue not the power to excommunicate. Why doo not you then, (if you will answere) proove by the worde of God, that euery particular flock in a kingdome or region, is of necessitie for the being of a Church to haue this power whole and seuerall by it selfe. I take it you shall neuer be able to proove that it ought to be, much lesse shall you be able to proove them to bee no true Churches, which haue not in euery seuerall congregation established the power of excommunication. For touching excommunication, there be Churches which are true Churches of Christ, which haue it not, nor iudge it needefull. Master Beza in his booke against Erastus pag.2. sayth: that he was charged by some, to esteeme them to be no Churches which wanted excommunication, or such a Presbyterie: which was vniustly layd to his charge, as he sayth, the perpetuall conuiction of him and those Churches, did sufficiently witnes. You haue more worke in hand here Master Barrow, then you bee ware of. For if you had proued that the Church of England hath no power to excommunicate, yet there remayneth a further thing which is not so easie as you take it to bee conuinced, namely that it is no true Church of Christ which hath no excommunication. All Churches are against you in this point, and the light of the truth

truth will be as strong against you, as it hath beene against the Anabaptists.

Here you make the chalenge anewe, and say: If I would vouchsafe to take mine aduersaries with me into the field, and giue them leaue to bring and to vse their owne weapons. I answere, that for all your outcries, yet there hath been no one weapon taken from ye, nor yet cut shorter. That speciall weapon which you now haue drawen and burnished, wherein you repose your truste, is this.

Where all the prophane and vngodly are receiued into, and retayned in the Church as members thereof, there cannot bee sayd the true established Church of Christ. But in the Church of England all the prophane multitudes & vngodly of the land were receiued into, & are retayned in their Church as members thereof. Therefore the Church of England in this estate cannot be sayd the true established Church of Christ.

You doo here conclude a new question, for there may bee a true Church of Christ, and yet not in all things rightly or truly established. Agayne, there be foure terminie in this your Sylogisme: because this clause (all the prophane & vngodly) is taken more largely in the maior, then it is in the minor, or else your maior is false also, & the scriptures which you quote falsely applied. It is certain that God did separate his Church from the Heathen Nations that did not call vpon his name. Such were not compelled to enter. But if you looke vpon the Church of Israel, the Nation of the Iewes, which had the couenant, when they fell into Idolatry and horrible impieties, you shall see that all the godly Kings of Iuda that reformed and restored the true worship of God, compelled all to the same. Doo you reade that the Idolaters of their seede, (which still after a sorte professed the God of Abraham, and had the seale of the couenant vpon them) were cast forth? You may see in the Prophet Sophonie, that in the dayes of the godly King Iosias, many of those Idolaters did turne, but feynedly for feare of punishment, and secretly worshipped Idoles. The nation of England did professe Iesus Christ, and were all sealed with the seale of the couenant, but yet ouerwhelmed generally in Idola-

ry and many horrible sinnes: Our Noble Quéene Elizabeth placed by God vpon the Regall throne, compelleth them all being her subiects, according to their vow in Baptisme to renounce Idolatry, and to imbrace the holy fayth and Religion of Christ, appoynting sharpe penalties for such as shall obstinately persist either in Idolatrie or other horrible sinnes. Now tell me Master Barrow, what doth she herein other then the godly kings of Iuda did? She receiueth not in nor compelleth Turkes, Iewes, or heathen, but onely such as are Christians by profession. And therefore you may see that if you will haue your maior proposition agree with the Scriptures, it must needes be taken more largely than your minor. And thus you are come forth into the field with your choyce weapon which deceiueth ye vtterly. But yet here to make some face of true zeale, you reckon vp a number of horrible sinnes. Indeede God requireth that al his seruants should vtterly abhorre and condemne such vices and speak against them, but he alloweth not any to take occasion thereby to condemne his Church. Such vices abound, but yet there are many thousands which cannot be charged w any one foule vice, whose conuersation in the profession of the true fayth, is & hath been with much more sobrietie and modesty then yours, (Master Barrow) vnlesse your time past haue beene better spent then the present. And when God shall open your eyes, & bisterror shall be vpon ye, ye shall know that I haue not by the deuill blasphemed yee, but shewed by Gods worde, that you haue with horrible presumption and intrusion into Gods iudgement seate, and with most sauage crueltie sought to rend vp and to teare the Lordes tender plants.

In the next place commeth the Baptizing the Children of prophane men which professe Christ, and remaine in the Church. Here Master Barrow you are in a wonderfull displeasure, and can not satisfie your selfe with all the varietie of odious tearmes which you doe euen some out. The heresie which I haue vttered about this matter is so foule (as you take it) that after many extreame wordes, you say you may by the direct warrant of Gods word hold me and mine ordinary most hey-

heynous falsifiers, and corrupters of the whole law and worde of God, most blasphemous and pernitious false Prophets. A man would thinke at the reading of these words, that the whole Church were on fire, especially if I should repeate but the one halfe of your speeches, but that we know Master Barrow it is but your fashion: If it please God he may giue you some sparke of modestie. But touching the matter it selfe, I doo affirme that the children of prophane men which remayn in the Church professing Christ, whether they bee close hypocrites or openly wicked in conuersation, do belong to the couenaunt, are to be baptized, so that the Church take care for their instruction and education in the true fayth. Your cauills here about verball confession (which God alone can iudge) about parish assemblies (which are members of a Church, though euery one by it selfe seuerally hath not the full power, and so to be called a Church) about expresse contrariety, error and sacrilege (in my proposition as you say) are not worth the mention. Touching the Scriptures which I alleage to proove that the interest in the couenant doth not depend vpon the syncere fayth or godlines of the next parents, you curie out of so many errors, mischiues, and blasphemies, that you doubt not (as you say) to pronounce and reiect these doctrines of this false Prophet most blasphemous and deuilish.

But now if it be true which I say and proue, against whom haue you powred foorth your poyson? And what bring you to disproue it; But that then all the world is within the Church holy, all being sprong within farre lesse then a thousand generations of many faithfull, and lineally come from the Patriarch *Noah*? And that then ought the Israelites vnder the lawe to haue circumcised all their captiue Cananites and heathen that came into their power. Then ought the Church now to baptize al the seed euen of the most wicked and vngodly, whether Turkes, Papists, Idolaters, &c.

You are out of the way Master Barrow, and the faster you runne, the further: for you should remember that I spake of the seede of such prophane men as remayne in the Church and professe Christ, and are sealed with the seale of the Couenant.

Will

Will you make no difference betweene thase which were or are without the Church vncircumcised, or vnbaptized, not profes-sing the God of Abraham, or the faith of Christ, and those which were or be in the Church, circumcised or baptized, professing the the God of Abraham and the faith of Christ? The Cananites and other heathen, if they forsooke false Gods, and imbraced the religion of the true God, were circumcised: & so may the Turks and heathen be baptized at this day. But while they are with-out and blaspheme and renounce Christ, what hath the Church to do with their children, which are not vnder her gouernment and power to bring vp? The Church is to take care that al those children may bee instructed in the faith, and guided in the way of godlines, which she admitteth vnto baptisme. For the places of Scripture, where I sayd that the couenant with Abraham was made thus, I will bee thy God, and the God of thy seede, and that to a thousand generations, Exod. 20. And that because of this S. Peter calleth all the Jewes in generall, *the children of the Prophets and of the couenant*. Act. 3. 25. and Paule, Rom. 9. 4 For which respect they are called holy, Rom. 11. And the child-ren of Idolaters among them are called Gods children, Ezech. 16. The whole nation of the Jewes, a very fewe men excepted, did at sundrie times very grieuously sinne against the Lord, and the greater part of those neuer returned by true repentance, but yet remayned in the profession of the God of Abraham, and were circumcised. If the couenant had been disanulled to their seede, how could Saint Peter say, they were the children of the Cou-enant? Or how could Saint Paule say, that theirs was the a-doption and the Couenant? If none were outwardly to stand vnder the Couenant but the elect, how should this haue been spo-ken? Or if the Couenant had been disanulled by their fathers sinnes? Unto this (Master Barrow) you haue made none an-swer at all. But you take occasion at that which I alleage out of Exod. 20. to make some colour or shewe of matter, and say that I wittingly suppresse the next words of the sentence, which are these; *of them that loue me and keepe my commandements*, which shew to whom this couenant is made and belongeth, and the condition on our part. And you require that I should shew

one

one place through the whole Scripture, where the Lords Co-
uenant is made vnto vs without this condition, and then you
say I may peraduenture cléere my selfe, and mine ordinarie for
publishing this wicked and diuellish heresie, so directly contrary
to the whole Scriptures in more then a thousand places. Thus
is your pleasure (Master Barrow) euen in your deepe igno-
rance, and that in the grounds of Religion, to impugne the
stablenes of Gods couenant made vnto his people. It is a thing
indeed which any godly mind may with horror tremble at, when
with such furie you terme it a diuellish heresie, which is indeed
that doctrine of grace deliuered in the Scriptures, whereby the
glorie of the Lord is most highly magnified. It is certayne that
the Couenant or promise of God doth not profite any, vnlesse
they receiue it, as the holy Ghost speaketh, *mixed with faith*.
Heb. 4. 2. Then where true faith is, there is sanctification, there
is obedience according to the measure of that faith greater or
lesse.

Hereupon it followeth, that as God is become their God, so
they are become his people, and this is required on our part.
But now to inferre vpon this, that the stablenes of Gods cou-
nant dependeth vpon this condition, if we keepe his comman-
ments, and that a man, yea a whole Church doth forfeit the co-
uenant (as your phrase is) if they shewe rebellion, is most wic-
ked. For what is more manifest then this, that if it had been so,
the couenant had been forfeited almost vnto all Israel, and that
very often, for they oftentimes rebelled against God most grie-
uously, and brake promise on their part. The complaints of the
Prophets are many: sundrie Psalmes do set it forth: the booke
of the Iudges declareth how oft they rebelled and fel vnto foule
Idolatrie, and how oft he plagued them, and humbled them by
deliuering them into the hands of heathen Kings. You will say
they rebelled, but repented. And in the dayes of euery godly
Iudge, and godly King were the visible Church. But in the
times of their defection when they committed Idolatrie, you
say they were not the visible Church. Yea you alleage testimo-
nies of Scripture, to proue that in their defection they were not
the Lords people: as Deuteronom. 32. 19. Micha. 2. 7. 8. 9.

Amos.3.2. Ezech.16. Alas Maister Barrow, would any man looke for such matter at their hands that had but euen read ouer the Bible? It is declared by Moses, that God chose them to be his people not for their owne righteousnes, but of free mercie, and made his couenant with them. Likewise it is most certayne that hee continued his faith towards them, not for that they kept couenant with him, (for they often rebelled) but for his own names sake.

To say that they forfeited the Couenant by transgressing his commandements, and recouered it agayne by repentance, and so to be now out now in, is (that I may say no worse) most foolishly spoken. For they did not enter agayne into a couenant which was lost because they repented, but contrariwise they repented because they were in the couenant. That is, because he had sworne vnto them to bee their God, hee not onely brought them downe by afflictions, chastising them as a father, but gaue them the graces of repentance. This is shewed Psalm. 106. where the Prophet hauing set forth their manifold rebellions, and the plagues wherewith he plagued them, he sayth: *When they were brought downe by affliction, he looked to their distresse and heard their cry. And remembred for them his couenant: and repented for the multitude of his mercies.* The Lord sayth also, *He foreknewe them to be an hard people: that their necke was as a barre of yron, and their forehead of brasse, and that they would deale vnfaithfully.* Esay. 48. vers. 4. 8. Yet he sayth, *I will be long suffering for my names sake, and for my praise, I will refraine mine anger towards thee, that I may not cut thee off.* vers. 9. It were too long to repeate all the Scriptures where the Lord pronounceth that he chose them for his owne names sake, that they dealt vnfaithfully, and yet he kept them as his people, and forgaue their iniquities euen for himselfe. You will say, that Gods couenant was to the elect among them, but the rest were not vnder the couenant, nor the visible Church. This is your grieuous blindnes, that you cannot see that many stand outwardly vnder the couenant, and are the visible Church, which yet receiue no benefite thereby, being wicked euen voyd of faith. And for this cause although the great swarme of the Israelites were wicked reprobates,

hates, and (as the Prophet sayth) but a remnant saued, yet for their outward profession the whole Nation was euer sayd to stand vnder the couenant. Otherwise how could it be sayd, *That Christ came among his owne, and his owne receiued him not?* Ioh. 1. How could these wicked infidels be called his owne, in any other respect, but that they stood outwardly vnder the couenant, and were the visible Church? And therefore when the bodie of that people should stand no longer vnder the couenant, to be the visible Church, but (as our Sauiour sayth) *the kingdome of God should be taken from them.* Math. 21. The Lord (to shew that he had still kept his couenant with them, euen vntill that time in which they now breake off themselues, and that hee had giuen their mother no bill of diuorse) asketh, *where the bill of diuorse of their mother is, by which he had put her away?* Esay. 50. vers. 1. The tenne Tribes which fell from the house of Dauid, and worshipped Idols, were yet in some sort euen the whole bodie of them vnder the Couenant, and were so farre the visible Church: for otherwise how should the Lord bee called their God? For when Benhadab made warre agaynst Achab, and tooke the foyle, and his seruants counselled him to enterprise the warre agayne, and to fight with them in the valleyes, saying: *That the God of Israel was the God of the mountaines, the Lord tooke it agaynst himselfe, and gaue them the ouerthrow the second time.* 1. King. 20. Achazias K. of Israel being sicke vpon a fall he had taken, sent his messengers to enquire of Baalzebub the God of Ekron. Elias the Prophet is sent to meete them, and to say, *Is it not because there is no God in Israel, that you goe to enquire of Baalzebub, the God of Ekron?* 2. King. 1.

Now, for the places which you alleage that they became not his people, you doo but peruert them. For the song Deuteron. 32. vers. 5. If you will vnderstand it so as you here apply it, how should they after bee called his people and his seruants in the same song? vers. 36. The breuitie and the placing of the words in that sentence doo make it darke. This is the sense, *That the peruerse generation corrupt themselues by their owne vice, which is not of his children.* For the holines of Gods children is from him; but when they transgresse and corrupt themselues, it is

 from

from their owne vice. And hee calleth all the whole people his ſonnes and daughters, not in reſpect of ſome former eſtate, (as you vainly imagine; ſeeing that very fewe of them were his ſonnes and daughters indeede in their beſt eſtate) but in reſpect that they ſtood outwardly vnder his couenant, and profeſſed his name. And that the Lord ſayth, *Yeſterday which was my people, is riſen as an enemie.* Mich. 2. verſ. 8. is not to ſhewe that they were now quite remoued and caſt off by the Lord from being vnder his couenant, though the multitude were the Church but in name; but their hoſtilitie among themſelues, both in Iuda and Iſrael. The ende which God ſayd was come to his people Amos. 8. is meant of their ſubuerſion and captiuitie. Will you ſay that they were neuer after nor no longer Gods people? If you dare not ſay this, why doo you alleage that place? You would haue me ſhewe ſome place in the Scriptures where God maketh his couenant without this condition, that they ſhall bee his people and obey him.

That is not the queſtion Maſter Barrow, but this, whether, when men breake couenant and promiſe with God by diſobeying him, whoſe couenant yet they chalenge, his couenant be broken and abrogated towards them? And for this I ſhewed you the plaine Scripture, Pſalm. 89. where the Lord ſaith: *If they ſhould forſake his law, he would viſite their offences or defections with the rod: but he will not diſannull his mercie towards them, nor falſifie his fayth. That he will not prophane his couenaunt, nor alter the thing which is gone out of his lippes.* Maſter Barrow, what can be more expreſſe then this, to ſhew the ſtablenes of Gods couenant dependeth not vpon our obedience, or vpon that condition which you ſpeake of, and ſay the couenant ſtandeth no longer then they ſtand obedient? Why did you not anſwere this place, but require ſtill to haue that ſhewed which is playnly ſhewed you before? Solomon on his part brake couenant with God, will you ſay he did forfeyte the couenant? I conclude therfore with the ſaying of Saynt Paul, where hee ſpeaketh of the Iewes what preferment they had aboue other. *What if ſome of them were vnfaythfull, ſhall their vnbeliefe make the fayth of God of none effect? God forbid. Yea let God be true, and euery man a ly-*

er

Rom. 4. Ceaſe therefore Maſter Barrow to haue the ſtabilnes of Gods couenant vpon the obedience of man, and do not ſo peruerſly reaſon againſt the truth in affirming that the couenant of God was diſanulled toward the Iewes, not to ſtand as the viſible Church, before ſuch time as they had reiected Chriſt.

The next thing is that I ſay eyther wee are within the couenant from our Anceſtors, and haue the ſeale thereof, euen Baptiſme, or elſe your ſelues are without Baptiſme, and ſo muſt either with the Catabaptiſts rebaptize, or elſe holde the couenant without a ſeale. Neyther of theſe you will doo, and yet ſtand in it that we haue no true Church nor true Sacraments. This therefore is your anſwere.

The Iſraelites in their Schiſme, and the Iewes in their Apoſtaſie, ſtill had and vſed Circumciſion. This Circumciſion was no true Sacrament vnto them, neither ſealed the Lords couenant vnto them in that eſtate. Yet was this circumciſion true Circumciſion, concerning the outward cutting; and was vpon their repentance and returne, neither defaced nor reiterate, but they were reſtored to the Temple, and receiued to the paſſouer. In like manner in this generall Apoſtaſie and defection from the Goſpell, the Baptiſme continued in theſe Apoſtaticall and falſe Churches, cannot in this eſtate thus adminiſtred, be ſayd a true Sacrament or ſeale of Gods couenant vnto them. Yet concerning the outward waſhing, it is true Baptiſme, the outward action needs not, and ought not to bee againe repeated, after the abuſe thereof in the falſe Church is purged away by true repentance.

Thus farre be your wordes Maſter Barrow. Alas poore creatures, how much is your ſtely blindnes to bee pitied, that can ſet down things ſo directly contrary at the ſame inſtant, & yet eſpie it not? for you ſay that Circumciſion in their Apoſtaſie was no true Sacrament vnto them, neither ſealed the Lords couenant vnto them in that eſtate. And yet (you ſay) it was true Circumciſion concerning the outward cutting. Likewiſe you ſay that Baptiſme in the poperie cannot bee ſaide a true Sacrament or ſeale of Gods couenant vnto them. And yet concerning

the outward washing ye confesse it true Baptisme. Is not this all one, as if a man should say, it is the true sacrament and seale of Gods couenant; it is no true Sacrament nor seale of Gods couenant? I pray you M. Barrow, is not the outward washing the whole Baptisme, and the whole seale of Gods couenant? Was not the outward cutting the whole circumcision, and the whole seale of Gods couenant? And if the outward washing be the whole Sacrament, and the whole seale of Gods couenant, as indeede with the word it is: (for the inward grace is no part of the Sacrament, but we may say that this inward grace is the thing represented and sealed by the Sacrament.) Then when you say concerning the outward washing it is true Baptisme: doo you not affirme the whole Sacrament and so the whole seale of Gods couenant to be true? But you say, it is no true seale vnto them in their Apostasie, or it doth not seale Gods Couenant vnto them in that estate, but when the abuse thereof is purged away by true repentance. What absurde speeches be these? can a man deuise more grosse folly? the outward true Sacrament, is the true seale of Gods couenant, euen vnto those which be hypocrites, and vtterly voyde of fayth, which haue it. For if we shall say it is no true Sacrament, or no seale of Gods couenant, or that it doth not seale Gods couenant, but vnto those which haue the inward grace, the efficacie and fruite thereof: then was it sometimes no true Sacrament which the Apostles themselues did administer, because there were some vnto whome they did administer both the holy Baptisme and the Lords Supper, which had not the inward grace. And if the Sacraments be not the true seales of Gods Couenant, euen vnto those which haue no fruite thereby; how should the receiuers which are vtterly vnworthie, be guiltie of the body and blood of our Lord? Also when a man doth receiue Baptisme which is alwayes the seale of Gods couenant, and is voyde of fayth, and receiueth it at their handes which do mixe it with sundry additions and corruptions, and after commeth vnto true faith, he himselfe is purged by his fayth, and hath the vse of that seale which hee had before, but without fruite, we cannot say as you doo, but with most wicked and foule absurditie, that the Sa-

crament

crament it selfe was a false Sacrament, and now through faith is purged and became a true Sacrament. That which is the Lordes doth stand in it selfe pure and undefiled, euen when corruptions bee added. The Wheat in it selfe is as pure lying among the Chaffe, as when it is purged from the Chaffe. The golde and siluer in themselues be as pure when the rust is vpon them, as when it is scowred off. If a thing in the mixture of corruptions haue not a true being, ye cannot by purging bring it to haue a true being. And when you say that concerning the outward washing it is true Baptisme ministred in popery, which is as much as I haue shewed, as to say it is a true sacrament concerning the whole (because the outward washing is the whole, and therefore all that Iohn the Baptist taketh to himselfe is this, I baptize ye with water). Doo you not acknowledge a ministrie in popery? Will you say it is concerning the outward washing true Baptisme, by whomesoeuer it bee done? Nay, you say where there is no true ministrie there is no true Sacrament. Then where there is no part of a true ministrie, there is no part of a true Sacrament.

In your other booke Master Barrow, which you tearme a briefe discouerie of the false Church, from the 102. page, vnto 121. you make a large discourse about this point, taking vppon you to bee a stickeler, betweene Master Doctor Some, and the Scholler of Oxenford, writing against him in defence of Master Penrie. There you lay about you with your woodknife vpon both parties. Master Doctor Some holding the Baptisme administred in the popery to be true Baptisme, alleaging that Master Caluine held so, as in deede all the Churches, and all the most excellent and worthy lights, which God hath raised vp in these last times, doo hold the same with sound reasons from the Scripture, you scoffingly tearme him a great Clarke, and say, that in certaine marginal notes added to his booke, this inconuenience was moued vnto his further consideration, how hee would auoyde the blowe of flat Schisme? Also you say he was friendly aduised to spare this deepe diuinitie, deriued from Master Caluine and others of this time, least hee should open such a gappe to the Papistes, as neither the Church of England

land nor Geneua, nor any other that hold this opinion shall euer be able to shut, for if it be true Baptisme deliuered in the Church of Rome, then will it follow that the Popish priests be true ministers. And then may the seale of the couenant be giuen to open Idolaters, then dooth Gods couenant of peace belong to the babilonish harlot, then hath Christ many bodies, or else cannot three so diuers Churches, as the Church of Rome, the Church of England, the Church of Geneua, all or any two of them (I will not say any one) bee true Churches. The he may be an husband where his wiues rule. Infinit other absurdities would then proue lawful. And let me adde yet this vnto the rest: if the Baptisme of the Church of Rome be a true Sacrament, then haue they one true Sacrament, and another false. Thus you wound the one party, that is Master Doctor Some. Then touching the Scholler of Oxenford, he is blamed for that he alleageth for his patron Master Doctor Fulke, to proue that the Baptisme administred in popery, is no true Baptisme. And he is set to counteruaile Master Caluin, as his equall in all learning. Grieuous absurdities you shew in deede, which must needs follow from the opinion of the foresaid Scholler. Touching the comparison betweene Master Fulke and Master Caluine, for my part I am not so learned, as that I can bring a full measure to measure them iustly withall. I know not what might slip from Doctor Fulke, in any part of his writings, vpon some occasion which may seeme as though he fauored that opinion: but this I know, that sundry times crauing his iudgement in that matter, he held it to be true Baptisme which hath been administred in the popery. And what a thing is this Master Barrow, that when you haue a long time taken on, you yeld the whole matter vnto Master Doctor Some. For what hath he said more, then that it was and is true Baptisme touching the outward washing? Doth he euer say that all which haue the true seale, haue also the inward grace? And for warding the blow of that schisme: it is a very weake blow. The Romish Antichrist vsurped an vniust power and tyrannie, and brought in many most wicked abominations, cannot the Churches cast him forth, with his inuentions, but they commit Schisme?

Can

Can any thing be more friuolous? Are all seuerall kingdomes tied vnto Rome, or shall we be tied to ioyne where there be some remnants of a Church, with Idolatrie? And concerning the rest, you selfe do in effect now confesse, that some part of Christs ministry remaineth in the popery, when you say that their Baptisme concerning the outward washing, is true Baptisme. And moreouer what should he, we dispute not, but this proueth that the true seale of Gods couenant is given to open Idolaters. For the seale is the same in it selfe, but the Idolater hath not the fruite of it, vntill he come to true faith. And so your next absurdities fall off themselues, seeing the hauing of the true seale (that is the outward washing in Baptisme) doth not make the papists true Christians, nor proue that Gods couenant of peace and loue, doth belong to the Romish harlot: so many among them as come to true faith, receiue that vse of the seale. All this I say doth follow vpon your owne confession, who build with the one hand, and breake down with the other. But it passeth all the rest, that then Christ must needs haue diuers seuerall bodies, or else he cannot stand an head to three so diuers Churches, as the Church of Rome, the Church of England, and the Church of Geneua. Why Master Barrow, you will not deny but that to the elect in the Church of Rome Christ is the head. And this is further to be noted, that when we speak of a visible Church, we speake not of men alone, but of Gods ordinances. And so touching the holy Sacrament of Baptisme in the Church of Rome, and so much of the truth as remaineth, Christ is the Author of them, and so standeth the head of his own, he is not the head of the Apostasie, or to the wicked inuentions. So then in all Churches Christ is the Author and head of that which is his ordinance, and of those which belong vnto him. What blasphemies are then hereby allowed? And if the Papists haue quite ouerthrown the one Sacrament, by turning it from a Sacrament, into a Sacrifice propitiatory, what reason is it therefore to say Baptisme is ouerthrowne? We must yet a little further deale about the Church of Rome, because you make all our people to be but as heathen without the couenant, and not rightly entred to become a visible Church: but all

receiued in at the sound of her Watchmes trumpet. I say our people stood vnder the couenant before, as a part of the visible Church; and that our soueraigne Queene did not compell those which before were not vnder the couenãt, to become the church, but by her regall power giuen vnto her of God, banished the vsurped power of Antichrist, abolished Idolatry, and compelled her people, hauing receaued the seale of the covenant and professing Christ, to receiue also the true doctrine. This was not to begin a Church, but to reforme a Church: hereupon it falleth out in question, whether the Church of Rome were the visible Church of Christ in time of Idolatry. It is vsually said, that the Church is in the papacy, but the papacy is not the Church: I said we may rather say (to speake more plainely) the papacy was in the Church, because Antichrist who brought in all the papacy, erected his throne in the Church. You begin with this Master Barrow, and say that I hold it not enough to affirme with the learned deuines, that the inuisible Church of God is in the papacy, as in all other places of the world, because God hath his elect there, and in all other places: but to be singular, I haue inuerted the proposition, and say that the papacy is in the Church. O Master Barrow, it is your bold ignorance as in all other matters? Who be those learned diuines, that when they say the Church is in the papacy, but the papacy is not the Church, doo meane no more but that there be Gods Elect, as in other places of the world? If you haue any modesty, bring forth some one learned deuine which is of that iudgement. I did like rather to say the papacy is in the Church, then to say the Church is in the papacie, because I see diuers doo mistake it, as though it were onely meant, that in the papacy there are Gods Elect and no further, that is no outward visible Church in any respect. I doo not differ any iot in the speech from the sense which Master Caluine and others doo giue: for when I say the papacy is in the church, but the papacy is not the church: by the papacy we must needs vnderstand that vsurped tyranny of the Pope and his Clergy, with all their abominable inuentions. By the Church we may not vnderstand only Gods Elect, but also so much of Gods ordinances as remaine, not only

in the points of doctrine, and publike profession of the name of Christ, but also in the holy Baptisme, the seale of the couenant which all haue, and may so farre be called the visible Church. That the papacy should inuade the visible Church, remaine in it, and not vtterly or quite destroy it, I did alleage that Saint Paule saith, Antichrist should sit in Gods Temple.

Now let vs see whether this bee not the meaning of the most learned diuines, when they say the Church is in the papacy. Master Caluine handleth this point in the fourth booke of his Institutions, Chap. 2. section 11, 12. Which booke though it be in our language, yet is it little read and studied of our people, as the weakenes and readines of many to be seduced by hereticks and schismatickes dooth euidently declare. I will set downe his words for such as haue not the booke. But yet as of old time (saith Master Caluine) among the Iewes there remained certaine peculiar prerogatiues of the Church, so doo wee not at this day take from the papists, those steppes of the Church which God would haue to remaine among them, notwithstanding the dissipation. God had once made his couenant with those Iewes, that same couenant did continue vpholden by the stablenes of it selfe, as it were wrastling against their impietie, rather then kept of them. Such therefore is the certainty and constancy of Gods goodnes, that there remained the couenant of the Lord, neither could his faith giuen, be made voyde by their vnfaithfulnes, neither could circumcision be so prophaned by their impure hands, but that it was still the true signe and Sacrament of his couenant. Whereupon the Lord called the Children which were borne vnto them, his sonnes, Ezech. 16. which nothing at all perteined vnto him, but by a speciall blessing. So when he hath left his couenant in France, Italie, Germany, Spayne, England: since these Prouinces haue beene oppressed with the tyrannie of Antichrist, yet that his Couenant might remaine inuiolable, he first there preserued Baptisme, the testimony of his couenant, which being consecrate with his owne mouth, retaineth her owne force, notwithstanding the vngodlines of man: then furthermore he hath by his prouidence brought to passe, that there should other

remnants also remaine, least the Church should vtterly perish. And as oftentimes buildings are so pulled downe, that the foundations and ruines remaine, so hee hath not suffered his Church to be subuerted by Antichrist, euen from the foundation, or to be laide euen with the ground (howsoeuer to punish mens ingratitude, which had despised his word, he hath suffered horrible shaking and dissipation to chance) but euen after the laying waste, hee would haue the building remaine, halfe pulled downe. Whereas therefore wee will not simplie graunt to the Papists the title of the Church, we doo not therefore deny that there bee Churches among them: but onely wee contend about the true and lawful ordering of the Church, which is required both in the Communion of the holy things, which are the signes of the profession, & also of doctrine most chiefelie. Daniel and Paule foretold that Antichrist should sit in the Temple of God: among vs wee account the Bishop of Rome the Captaine and standerd bearer of that wicked and abominable Kingdome. That his seate is placed in the Temple of God, thereby is meant that his Kingdome shall be such, as may abolish neither the name of Christ nor of the Church. Hereby therefore it is manifest, that we denie not but that there remaine Churches also vnder his tyrannie: but yet such as hee hath prophaned with sacrilegious impietie: such as hee hath afflicted with outragious dominion: such as he hath corrupted and almost killed with euill and deadly doctrines, as it were with poysoned drinkes: in which Christ lieth halfe buried, the Gospel ouerwhelmed, godlines expelled, the worship of God almost abolished: furthermore in which all things are so confused and out of order, that there appeareth the face of Babylon, rather then of the holy citie of God. Briefelie, I say they be Churches, in as much as the Lord dooth there mercifoullie preserue the remnants of his people, howsoeuer miserably dispersed and scatred: and in as much as there remaine some badges or seales of the Church, and these especially, whose efficacy neither the craft of the diuell, nor the wickednes of men can destroy: but on the other side, because those notes or markes are blotted out, which wee ought chiefely to respect in this con-

trouersie,

stodutie, I say that euerie one of their assemblies, and the whole bodie wanteth the lawfull forme of a Church.

Thus farre be Master Caluines words: tell me now Master Barrow, is Master Caluine to be accounted among the learned Diuines? Dooth he say the Church is in the papacy, that is no more but that the Elect are among them, as in other places of the Worde? Looke also what I haue said touching this whole matter which he dooth not here say, yea euen from that which is in Ezechiel 16. Where you aske, who but this peruerse fellow (speaking of me) could thus stumble and reuile at these words, my sonnes and my daughters, &c? But if it bee not plaine enough which Master Caluin saith in this which I haue recited, to proue that you would beare the simple in hand, that the learned Diuines are of another minde, and yet vnderstand not their minde: I will adde a little more out of the same Author. In his Epistle 404. thus hee writeth, *Quod ecclesia reliquias manere in papatu dico, nō restringo ad electos qui illic dispersi sunt: sed ruinas dissipatæ ecclesiæ illic extare intelligo. Ac ne mihi longis rationibus disputandum sit, nos pauli authoritate contentos esse decet, qui Antichristum in templo dei sessurum pronuntiat: quamquam & hoc rationibus satis validis me probasse puto, ecclesiam, licet semiruptam, imo si libet, diruptam, ac deformem, aliquam tamen manere in papatu.* In that I say the remnants of the Church remaine in the papacy, I doo not restraine it to the Elect which are dispersed there: but I meane that the ruines of a dispersed Church are extant among them. And that I may not dispute the matter with reasons at large, it becommeth vs to be content and satisfied with the authority of Paule, which pronounceth that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God. Albeit I suppose I haue proued this with reasons strong enough, that there remaineth neuertheless some Church in the papacy, although halfe broken downe, or if you will, broken downe, and deformed. Also Master Beza, Epistle 81. page 356. for the remnants of the Church in the papacy is of the same minde, affirming that there remaine not onely Gods Elect, but also the Sacrament of Baptisme, and sundry points of sound doctrine.

Now let vs see what horrible blasphemies you say will follow of this that I say, Antichrist should sit in the Church, and yet the same remayne still the visible Church, so farre forth as Master Caluines words and Master Bezas doo import. For when you will needes haue it that God hath giuen me vp into a reprobate sense, the matter toucheth not me so much, as Master Caluine and Beza, and many other most worthie men which so expound it. Nay, if God open your eyes you shall see whether you doo not like Rabsaka reproach the Lord God who hath vttered it by his Apostle. The first is this: If Antichrist may be sayd to sit, raigne and remayne in the Church of God, then Christ is not made heire and Lord of all, and set as King vpon Mount Sion. A worthie collection is it not? because God in righteous iudgement for the punishment of those that receiued not the loue of the trueth, giueth power vnto Satan and Antichrist to seduce the multitude in the visible Church, Christ is not heire of all things, nor raigneth as K. vpon Mount Sion. Will you say, if the diuell haue a kingdome in the world, Christ is not Lord of the whole world? Mount Sion may be vsed for the visible Church, but most properly for the inuisible which is the Communion of Saints, of which are none but the elect. Satan and Antichrist are not able to pluck one of these out of his hand, he raigneth ouer them and in them. Moreouer, he raigneth ouer the whole visible Church and ouer the whole world (for hee is ascended, and filleth all things) so that Satan, Antichrist and all Tyrants, can proceed no further then his will.

The next is: If Antichrist sit in the Church, then Christ is either cast out of his house made subiect vnto Antichrist, or els deuideth with him. Christ is not cast out of his house nor made subiect, (these be most friuolous and fantasticall imaginations) but in his most high and soueraigne power he vseth Antichrist and Satan as the instruments of his wrath, not vtterly to raze and destroy his Temple, but miserably to afflict the chosen, and so seduce the reprobate, euen all wicked hypocrites which are in the visible Church. I knowe not what you will vnderstand by diuiding, but the diuell may in some sense be sayd to diuide with God, in that he receiueth one part vnto damnation.

The third is: If Antichrist sit in the church, then the church of Christ may remayne subiect vnto and be gouerned by Antichrist. Here we must distinguish. First, the visible Church consisteth of men, and of Gods ordinances. The men are of two sorts, the elect and the reprobate. He exerciseth a sauage tyrannie, and oppresseth the elect whome yet he cannot bring into his subiection, to make them hang their faith vpō him, or his lawes. For God did miraculously preserue a remnant in the popedome, which were not vtterly poysoned. He corrupteth the lawes and ordinances of Christ, but yet had not power giuen him to destroy all. His full dominion is ouer the reprobate, which receiue his marke and worship him.

The fourth is: If Antichrist sit in the Church, then the Church is subiect vnto two heads, and Christ then is not the onely head. This is fully answered in the former: for his tyrannie and vsurpation doth not make him head, but vnto those whole head Christ is not, more then by hypocriticall profession of his name.

The fift is: If Antichrist sit in the Church, then Antichrists ministers and marked seruants may be brought into and set ouer the Church of God, & then is not Christs ministrie which he hath ordeined in his Gospell and his Church, permanent vnto the worlds end, but variable at the will of man, and then may the Church of God cast out Christs ministrie, and receiue Antichrists.

This is also most friuolous: for as Antichrist did almost destroy all, but yet not all, in other things, so in the ministrie: for the ministrie of Christ was not vtterly destroyed. Agayne, the Church if you vnderstand Gods true people, did not this: but Antichrist did it.

The sixt is: That if Antichrists lawes may be brought and set vp, and remayne in the Church, then Christ is not the onely Prophet and lawgiuer, and then may the Church be built vpon another foundation then vpon Gods word. Christ is the onely true Prophet, whose lawes onely are wholesome. Antichrist hath vsurped a power to make lawes and to set them vp in the Church. The elect, though some of them for a time haue gone

a strap

estray and followey Antichrist, vntill it pleased GOD to open their eyes: and many of them, holding Christ haue been infected and stayned with sundrie errors of Antichrist, yet their saluation being onely through faith, it cannot be sayd that they were built vpon any other foundation then that which the Prophets and Apostles haue layd. The reprobate which haue worshipped the beast, though in respect that hauing been borne vnder the Christian profession, and had the true seale of the Couenant, and professed the name of Christ, they might bee the visible Church, or of the visible Church, yet they were not built vpon Christ vnto saluation, but vpon the lawes of Antichrist vnto destruction.

The seuenth is, That if all Antichrists abominations, heresies and Idolatries may bee brought into and remayne in the Church of God, then no blasphemie, heresie, Apostasie, or any thing that man can commit or deuise, can break the couenant, If the fayth of God might be made of none effect by the vnfaithfulnes of men, it were a wofull case. The couenant of God is founded vpon free grace. The Lord would not (euen because of his Couenant) suffer the deuill and Antichrist vtterly to deface his Temple: but preserued the holy seede, preserued some of his ordinances, yea so farre, that in some sorte the Couenant was not disanulled to the very reprobate, but that outwardly they stoode vnder it in their Apostasie: and it might bee sayd of them (though indeede they were no true Children) as Saint Paul sayth of the rebellious Iewes, theirs is the Couenant and the Adoption.

The eight is, That if those that worship the beast and his Image may be sayd to be in the Church, and their seede outwardly within the Couenant, then the most abominable and execrable in this estate may be sayd members of Christ, washed and purged with his blood, sanctified and led by his spirite in assurance of saluation, for none can be sayd to bee within the Church but the members of the Church. And whosoeuer we may affirme to be within the Church, those (so long as they continue in that estate) we are also to iudge assuredly saued, for any thing to vs reuealed or knowen to the contrary. These are things easily spoken by such as are bolde to vtter whatsoe-

uer

ner they imagine. The Prophets complayned that the great multitude both of Iuda, and the ten Tribes were rebels, and that the Lord had but a remnant among them: shew when that multitude of open wicked ones, and their seede were cast out from being the visible Church, & then shew when they were receiued in agayn. For both these you must do, because the whole nation when Christ came were the children of the Couenant, & it is sayd that Christ came among his owne, and his owne receiued him not. You must proove that the Scribes and Pharisies, the high Priests and all the Capitall enemies of our Sauiour Christ were deemed vndoubtedly saued euen when they shewed their enmitie against him. For they were then in the Church. They could not sit in Moses chayre and not be in the Church. The Vineyard was not taken from those wicked husbandmen which had slayn the seruants, vntill they had slayn the sonne and heire himselfe. These things are so manifest by the Scriptures Master Barrow, that if it shall not please God to open your eyes to see your palpable grosse ignorance, and bolne presumption, yet others may see and tremble least God giue them ouer also, for the pride of their hearts.

Whereas I sayd that the Apostasie is in the Church but not the Church: you think it strange repugnancie. Yet indeed there is none, as may appeare by that which I haue set down before, and should appeare vnto you, if your minde were not so deepely infected with the principles of Donatisme. You runne still vpon this Rock, that because none ought to bee in the Church, but such as appeare godly, therefore no open Idolaters can be sayd to be in the visible Church, to stand outwardly, and their seede in any respect, vnder the couenant. I haue plainely prooued the contrary. What ought to be, is one thing: and what hath been or what is, is another. To your other question I answere, that it is no Schisme to depart from the Church of Rome, although in some respects they were the visible Church. This matter Master Barrow, hath beene as throughly pursued by the Papists as euer you or any Donatist shall be able, and such answere they haue receiued from the Churches that haue made separation from them, as that they

haue no cause to glory. The ten Tribes remayned still in some sorte the visible Church, and vnder the Couenant, as I haue proued before, but yet they were not such a true Church as men might ioyne withall in their worship: and therefore when Ieroboam had set vp the golden Calues, the Leuites departed from them and went to Ierusalem, 2. Chron. 11. 13. 14. Then you come to expound how this may bee taken that Antichrist shal sit in the Temple of God. And first as you take it his sitting in the Temple of God, may be vnderstood as in regarde that he tooke his originall before he was reuealed. Let any simple man looke vpon the wordes of Saint Paul, and see whether he speake of any such close sitting. Then that he should sit where sometimes the true Churches haue beene, which hee should so destroy and waste, as there should be no shape or steps of any of them left vpon the earth: as it was foretolde, Matth. 24, 29. Reuel. 6. 14. See what two places Master Barrow hath found to proue Antichrist should vtterly destroy the visible Church. These be the wordes: *And immediately after the oppression of those dayes the Sunne shall be darkned, & the Moone shall not giue her light, and the starres shall fall from heauen, and the powers of heauen shall be shaken.* This is spoken of Christs comming to iudgment, and is meant indeed of the Sunne, the Moone and starres themselues: and therefore most foolishly concluded, that Antichrist shall vtterly destroy the visible Church. And for the place in the Reuelation, *The heauen departed away as a booke that is roled vp*, you may euen as well conclude, that the whole Church in the world vtterly fayled, as to say therefore Antichrist vtterly defaced the visible Church. And if you will haue the matter tried by so darke a place, your light had need to be great. But your prettiest reasons of all are yet behinde. Antichrist shall be lifted vp aboue all that is called God, this can not be done by any Minister in the Church, seeing euery soule must bee subiect. They say it will weary an old horse to follow a Child vp and down all day that can neuer goe. I am sure it will weary any man to follow you Master Barrow in all your trifles. God commandeth euery soule shall submit it selfe vnto

the

the higher powers: doth it here vpon follow that if a king vsurp that which belongeth to God, they must therein obay him so long as he remayneth their king? Also when it is sayd, that he is God, you say what blasphemie will not insue, if this should be literally taken? It may as well be inforced (say you) by this place, that Antichrist is God, as that the place where he raigneth is the Temple of God. You will not haue this place expounded literally, and then what shall we make of it, or howe shall we finde Antichrist? May he not be the Turke or some other? If the Papists could proue ỳ which you speake, but with some litle shew, how much would they glory? For grant thē a mysticall sense of these words, and they will carie it whither they list. To exalt himselfe aboue all that is called God, is literally spoken, and literally fulfilled, when the Pope exalteth himselfe aboue all Kinges and Emperours which are called Gods. So that he shall sit as God in the Temple of God, shewing himselfe that he is God. What blasphemie is it which will ensue if these wordes bee all construed literally after the Grammaticall sense? The wordes doo not import that he shall bee God indeede, but that he shall take that to himselfe which belongeth to the most high God. The thing which deceiueth you Master Barrow, is in the word, shewing, for euery thing that a shew is made of, is not so in truth. There is a true shew and there is a false shew, when one doth arrogate that to himselfe, and boast of it, which belongeth not vnto him. As Antichrist vsurping not onely an earthly dignitie, but euen the high power and authority of God, is therefore sayd to shewe himselfe to bee God.

And now wheras I stand vpon this, that the Church of England was a true Church of God before popery, and that in popery it stood a member or part of the vniuersall visible Church (so farre as the remnants of Christs Church remained not vterly defaced by Antichrist) & that the casting out of Antichrist and his lawes, and vsurped power is not the beginning, but the restoring and repayring, or recouering a Church from miserable desolation. And as Iosias and other godly kings of Iuda by terrour of punishment draue Idolaters which outwardly stood

vnder the Couenant being circumcised, from false worship vnto the lawes of God: so Quéene Elizabeth hath done with her subiects being baptized, and thereby bound to renounce false worship, and to imbrace the holy doctrine of the Couenant.

Here you say that to make my conclusion follow, I must proue, and make euident demonstration by Scripture that the Church of England was rightly gathered vnto, and established in that holy fayth and order which Christ hath left vnto his Church in vniuersall and particular, according to the rules and examples in his Testament. Next, that they fell not away frō this holy fayth in the time of popery, and that now they continue and faythfully walke in the same fayth and order. If I had done this, you say I had powerfully conuinced and stopped the mouthes of all Schismatikes for euer. I see you can make your mach wisely Master Barrow. I must make euident demonstration by the Scriptures: of what? of that which was not mentioned by the Scriptures. For there is no particular mention of planting the fayth of Christ in England. If wee shew it out of auncient records, then doe I not satisfie your desire at all. Agayne it must be shewed by the Scriptures, that the Church of England receiued orderly the fayth and order of Christ, not onely in generall, but in euery particular. This is a surer knot than the former. And me thinkes you should bee a little more kinde, for the honour of your countrey: not that any honour is to be rendred against truth, but whereas you confesse that a true Church may erre in diuers things, so that it be not conuinced & sinne obstinately. If the planters of the fayth and discipline of Christ in England did erre it some things (which yet you know not) how can you tell but that they did it in simplicitie? wee see that in auncient times, and of late dayes GOD hath had many Children in England which haue bēn begotten and nourished vp in the land, and haue acknowledged her their mother. And we are sure hereupon that God hath put his couenant of mercy in England, and planted a true Church: And therefore if you deale rightly, you must proue against vs. I haue shewed that popery did not vtterly destroy the visible Church. And there be at this day multitudes that so walke in the holy fayth, that no

man

man is able to accuse them. And therefore if either all, or the most part of Schismatikes were not obstinate cauillers, their mouthes might be stopped for euer. Thus much might suffice against that you affirme our people neuer had any entrance to be vnder the couenant, and so to stand the visible Church, but to be as heapes of prophane heathen: but that your matter reacheth further then against the assemblies in England, condemning other Churches which professe the holy Gospel. And least some may think that in this point I charge yet out of some hard collection in so horrible presumption, as to condemne all Christian Churches, I will recite the wordes which you haue set downe in your other booke, pag. 33. where after long discourse against the reasons which Master Caluine vseth both out of the olde and new Testament, to proue that neither the worship it selfe, nor the faythfull are defiled by the company of the open wicked, you speake thus.

This and such like detestable stuffe, hath Master *Caluine* in his ignorance, partly to confute that damnable sect of Annabaptists, which fantastically dreame vnto themselues a Church without spot in this life, and for euery transgression that ariseth are ready to leaue & forsake the fellowship of the Church, without due and orderly reproofe. Partly also is this stuffe brought to defend his owne rash and disorderly proceedings at *Geneua*, whilest hee at the first dash made no scruple to receiue all the whole state, euen all the prophane ignorant people into the bosome of the Church, to administer the Sacraments vnto them: which confuse route could not fit with Christs heauenly gouernement, neither could it by any meanes agree vnto them in this estate. But that monstrous disorders and haynous enormityes dayly ensued thereof, whereby this their Church became a iust reproch vnto all men, euen to those wicked Heretikes, yea that which is worse, and more to be lamented, it became a miserable president, and pernitious example euen vnto all *Europe*, to fall into the like transgression: as the confused estate of all those regions (where the Gospell is thus disorderly taught) declareth.

Let the Reader here consider (Master Barrow) what a wor-

thie Champion you are become for the Papists, for Heretickes and Schismaticks, agaynst all the Churches which professe the Gospell, and agaynst all their teachers. What was Master Caluine to bee regarded, if he were so ignorant, so rash, and so disorderly in his doings? How miserable was his case, that he must be so pernitious an example to the ruine of many? What is or what hath the Church of Geneua been, and together with the assemblies of England, all Churches in Europe, but heapes of prophane multitudes, no better then heathen or dogs, if your words be true? True Christ they haue none, for they fit not his gouernment, nor his gouernment them (as you say). But Master Barrow, as the Churches and their ministers haue been able & haue iustly defended themselues (though not from all faults, because there is no Church so pure) agaynst the wisest and learnedst reuiling Rabsakaes, the Hereticks and Schismaticks: so must you thinke that they shall be able to withstand two or three which are so ignorant in some grounds of religion, as that their bookes are a bundle, or rather a dunghill of absurdities. Whom shal you euer perswade that hath any true light, that your knowledge so farre passeth the learned of all Churches? Were it not honour enough for ye to triumph ouer the ministers of the Church of England, whom so often in disdayne you terme learned Priests, but ye must be generall conquetors, like Alexander the great? Faine you would seeme to bee farre from the Anabaptists, but how neere you are vnto them, euen in their tents, all that haue skill do see. Well then to conclude this poynt, he that will finde a true Church with which he may ioyne himselfe, he must not seeke it in the publike assemblies either in England, Scotland, Geneua, or any region of Europe, (for by your iudgement they be all prophane heapes) but he must seeke the fellowship, and ioyne with the Donatists of England.

Now to the second part of the assumption, where you say, that the Church of England hath power to cast forth none by excommunication. I am of the minde that Christ hath giuen such a power to his Church, and also do take it that the Church of England is not voyd thereof. But you condemne all excommunication which is not executed by an Eldership, and the peo-

ple of euery particular assemblie. If excommunication be onely to bee so executed; then how could Esra with the Elders and Princes of Israel publish an excommunication generall against euery one that should not within three dayes come vp to Ierusalem? Esra. 10. vers. 8. And where doo you proue that excommunication is to be executed vpon any, but for contumacie and contempt of the Church? Doo you hold that a man which doth repent him for his adulterie, theft, heresie, or such like, and is cast downe in sorrowe, is yet to be deliuered vp to Satan? If not, why doo you vpbrayd, that there is none cast forth among vs, but for contumacie?

In the next place you take vpon you to confute and cut downe foure false expositions, as you say, of Mach. 18. vers. 17. Tell the Church. The first sort take the word Church, for the Pope: the second for the Archbishops and Bishops, which exercise this power for the whole Church: the third for the companie of the Elders apart from the people, which they call the Consistorie: the fourth are they which would haue the people excommunicate without the Elders.

The two first sorts (that is the Pope and the Bishops) doo depend (you say) vppon one line, and build their preheminence vpon the promise made to the Apostle Peter, Math. 16. vers. 18. 19. where the keyes of the kindome of heauen are giuen him. And vpon the Apostle Paul his example, who deliuered Hymeneus and Alexander vnto Satan, Timoth. 1. 20. You are so learned and skilfull (Master Barrow) yea so trustie and true, that wee must holde them for Oracles that doo proceede out of your mouth, although indeed they be neuer so false, as shall appeare. Touching the place in Mat. 16. for the keyes giuen vnto Peter, it is agreed vpon by all parts, there is a power giuen to be exercised in the Church. The disagreement is chiefly about this, to whom it is giuen. The Pope with his adherents sayth, it was giuen onely vnto Peter and his successors. He sayth further, that Peter was Bishop of Rome, that there is his chaire, and that this power is annexed to that chaire, and so the Pope alone is to haue it, and from him all other are to participate which shall exercise any part of it in the Church. The Bishops of the church

of England, and they that maintaine the gouernment by presbyteries do both alike condemne that challenge of the Pope, as an vsurpation. Both parts affirming, that although our Sauiour do speake onely to Peter, saying; to thee I giue the keyes of the kingdome of heauen: yet he giueth him nothing but that which he gaue vnto the other Apostles. This they proue by Ioh. 20. where he breathed vpon them, and sayd ioyntly to them all; *As the father sent me, so I send you, and whose sinnes ye shall forgiue they are forgiuen, &c.* With what face can you say then (Master Barrow) that the Bishops and the Pope depend vpon one line, and build their preheminence vpon that promise made vnto Peter? You might truelier haue sayd, that the Bishops and presbyteries depend vppon one line for their preheminence, not only for that they expound those places, Matth. 16. and Ioh. 20. alike, but also that the Bishops challenge none other power then the presbyteries do. For the controuersie betweene the Bishops and the presbyteries, is whether of them by Gods word, & for the benefit of the Church are to exercise that power which Christ hath left vnto her. The one side doth affirme, that by Gods word the execution of this her power doth belong to the Bishops, as being most properly the Apostles successors: and therefore do hold that the Church of England hath done right in reserving this power vnto them. The Churches which hold the other gouernment, do affirme, that when our Sauiour saith, tell the Church, it is not meant, tell the Bishop or those which are ioyned with them: but tell the Church, is tell the Consistorie, which consisteth of Pastors, Teachers, and Elders chosen from among the people. This Consistorie (say they) is to haue and to exercise that power and iurisdiction which the Bishops do hold. Now (Master Barrow) as you say, the gouernment thus by the Bishops is popish, so you grieuously condemne the Consistorie: affirming that it is irregular, that it hath no ground or warrant in Gods word, but vtterly subuerteth all order, and openeth a wide gap vnto all licentiousnes. &c.

Then come the fourth sort which expound these words (tell the church) wrong. And those are they which say tel the church, is tell the congregation of people without the Elders. Here you

shew some skill also to confute: which is but to fight with your owne shadow, for this fourth sort (I thinke) haue neuer bæn heard of, but among your selues. And in dæde your heauenly patterne (whatsoeuer ye speake of pastors, teachers, and Elders) is nothing else but an heape of people, without any of these officers. For was it euer heard of among men, that there bee offices, in which there is no power or authority at all annexed vnto the officers which execute them, not euen in the things wherein their offices consist, aboue those which haue not the same offices? For if it be true which you say, that the greatest minister hath no more power to bind or loose the sinnes of the least member, then the said member hath to bind or loose his. Or if Christ speake to all, euen to the wemen, Iohn 20. whose sinnes ye forgiue, they are forgiuen, &c. If the word haue no more efficacie to worke faith deliuered by the ministrie, or the Sacrament to seale the promises haue no more power deliuered by a minister, then when the same word is vttered, and those Sacraments deliuered by any man or by any woman, or if euery young man, yea euery maide (which is of the assembly) haue equall power with any to excommunicate, we would see wherein the power of any of your officers consisteth: where all or euery one haue equall power, there all are officers: where all are officers, we may say that in dæd none are publick officers. This is Master Barrowes heauenly patterne, by which he hath condemned all our Churches, and found them so obstinate for reiecting it, that they be quite separate from Christ. Master Barrow will say he spake not of the Sacraments, for he saith a minister onely is to deliuer them. And I say one part of the power of loosing is by the Sacraments, in as much as they seale our faith.

The power of discipline exercised by the presbytery, as it is in the Churches of France, Scotland, Geneua, the Low Countries, &c. you most grieuously condemne: the reader shall see your own words, in your other booke page 189. and 190. thus you speake. These men in stead of this grosse Antichristian gouernement, &c. would bring in a new adulterate forged gouernement in shew, or rather in despite of Christs blessed gouernement,

lerne ment, which they in their pride, rashnes, ignorance, and
ensualitie of their fleshly hearts, most miserably innouate, cor-
rupt and peruert, &c. Also page 166. you tearme Classical and
Prouinciall synods and counsels, a diuelish forgery. Here you
say the fault and pride of the Elders is intollerable. Also (you
say) that many were the reasons, and more the inconueniences
that might bee alleaged against this presumptuous irregular
consistorie, which hath no ground in the word of God, but vt-
terly subuerteth, destroyeth and corrupteth the whole order
and Communion of the Churches, openeth a wide gap vnto
all licentiousnes, and prophannes of manners, &c. Thus the
Church of England is no Church of Christ, because of their go-
uernement by Bishops. In other places where the gouerne-
ment is by presbyteries, not onely the people (by your sentence)
are prophane multitudes, but their ministers proud, rash, ig-
norant, and in the sensuality of their fleshly hearts, haue cor-
rupted Christes gouernement, & in despite thereof haue set vp
a diuelish forgery, and open the gap vnto all prophanenesse, &c.
O Master Barrow, what reproaches are these against all chur-
ches and their ministers? I must needs tell you againe, that
there is not any which hath any sparke of Christian modesty,
but will say God hath not sent ye, your sufferings are not to be
gloried in, you are but Rabsaka, that thus reproach the church
of Christ. What Schismaticks haue gone beyond ye? Now
followeth the suspension from the Sacraments. You must vn-
derstand, that al your friuolous cauils about this, and all your
reproaches reach not alone vnto the Church of England, but vn-
to all the reformed Churches which practise a suspention. Ma-
ster Beza in his booke against Erastus, page 10. sheweth the
vse and practise of it, not onely in their Church, but in the aun-
cient Churches. Also page 124. he proueth it by the example of
Moses sister, and of those which were restrained a whole month
from eating the passeouer: these ceased not in the meane time
to be accounted members of the congregation. When the re-
pentance is not throughly testified, or the rest stand in need of
some terror, as wel as the party that hath offended, then is there
vse of suspention.

To

To proue that neither the worship of God, nor yet the godly are polluted by the open wicked that communicate with them in the same, and that the couenant of God is in no wise thereby disanulled, I alleaged first the auncient Church for example, vnder the conduct of Moses in the wildernes, in which there were heapes of wicked rebels, and so in the time of Iesay, Ieremie, and other of the Prophets, whose complaints are grieuous: for it is manifest that few godly ones among swarmes of wicked did worship together in the Temple. Here Master Barrow your cauiles are more then slender: first that our Churches were neuer true Churches, and therefore no comparison betweene ours and them. Touching this I haue spoken before. Then next you say that in ꝑ times of wicked Kings, when Idolatry was set vp in Iuda, the godly did not communicate with the wicked, which is most true, but the wicked did Communicate with the godly in Gods true worship, in the dayes of godly Kings. And for the time of Moses, you say those wicked rebels were of the common wealth, but not of the Church, and would haue me proue that they were admitted to the Tabernacle or publick worship. If they were not of the Church still in outward account, how were their children all receiued? Or where reade you of any family among them, which was of the common wealth, and not of the Church? There is no shew of such a matter. Againe Saint Paule 1. Cor. 10. sheweth that they did all communicate in the Sacraments. *They did all eate the same spirituall meate, and drunke the same spirituall drunke.* What can be more clere then this? If men would not wickedly cauile against the holy Ghost.

Then next for the time that our Sauiour liued vpon the earth, in what miserable estate was the Church? The most of the teachers very corrupt, both in doctrine and maners very few of the people did in deed feare God, and yet came all on heapes to the Temple together with the godly. Vnto this you answer that at the byrth of our Sauiour, and vnto such time as they opposed themselues against him, things were in meetly good case. Would any man that were not past all care what he sayth, make such an answer? Did those grieuous sects of the

Scribes and Pharisies rise of a suddaine? Or did the high Priest by due course come to the office? Or were the open wicked separated, where such wicked men bare sway? And if they had not of some long time before, brought in their owne traditions, how could they haue called thē the traditions of their Fathers. Math. 15? Mark 7. And when the Pharisies, and Saducees, the Priests & Elders reiected and withstood our Sauiour, they, (you say) then ceased to be the visible Church, and that our Sauiour did separate himselfe and his Disciples from them.

What should one say vnto you Master Barrow, are you euen bent to gainsay the manifest word of Christ? The Scribes and Pharisies did sit in Moses chaire, Matth. 23. Was Moses Chaire out of the visible Church? And what can be more plaine then that our Sauiour willeth the people to heare them? For otherwise how should he commaunde them to obserue and doo all things which they should say: but after their workes he would not haue them doo? At this you set vp your throate and crie out; What execrable blasphemie and horrible heresies doth this wretched man runne into. &c.? Doth he not hereby make our Sauiour Christ guiltie of the open breach of Gods lawes, and the destruction of all the people? Indeed that were most horrible and damnable blasphemie, and he should be a most vile and wretched man, that should make our Sauiour guiltie of the breach of any lawe of God. And if you had but the true knowledge of some godly childe of foureteene yeres of age, you should plainly see that our Sauiour did command them indeed to heare the Scribes and Pharisies expounding the lawe and the Prophets, and that therein he is not guilty at all of the open breach of Gods lawes: but indeed if he therein committed any offence, it was but agaynst the principles of Donatisme and Annabaptisme, which Satan vnder the shewe of an Angell of light, hath bewitched men withall, and which you haue setled in your minde in stead of Gods lawes. For would you make vs beleeue that the Pharisies and Doctors of the lawe were euen of a suddaine become naught? Christ himselfe when he was twelue yeares old sate among them in the Temple, & did heare them and propound questions vnto them. Luk. 2. And when hee

preached

preached, his custome was to goe into the Synagog vppon the Sabboth, and to reade and expound the Scriptures. Luk. 4. But let vs see what you alleage to proove that he did not meane that men should heare them.

You demaunde, if God doo not in all places where he commandeth to heare true Prophets, forbid to heare false Prophets? What then Master Barrow, how blinde are you? Do you not know that our Sauiour by mentioning their sitting in Moses Chayre, doth bind the auditors to receiue their doctrine so farre as it was the true doctrine of Moses and the Prophets? Hee doth heare the false Prophet which heareth and receiueth false doctrine. So farre as the Pharisies set foorth the truth, so farre they were to bee heard, and their Doctrine as our Sauiour willeth, was to bee followed. But men were to take heede of their Leuine, that is of their false doctrine and humane traditions. Our Sauiour doth not at all approoue their open wickednes, when hee willeth them to follow that true Doctrine which they should deliuer out of Moses, and not to follow their workes. The Priests and teachers ought indeede to be holy, but it hath fallen out farre otherwise, and that many times in Gods Church. And now if it were an abuse that some of these Scribes and Pharisies which did teach, were not Leuites, but of some other Tribe, as Paul was of Beniamin: yet there were greater abuses about the high Priest, & the rest and begun long before that time: & yet the whole Church and our sauiour himself so long as he did liue as a priuate man, frequented the Temple and publike worship and heard them expound the Scriptures. Therefore Master Barrow, albeit you exclaime in this sorte, these blasphemies doth this wicked man publish, his ordinarie and all the Cleargie in England suffer them to passe in print: yet neither you nor all the Donatists and Anabaptists vnder heauen, shall euer be able with all your shifts to wring this place from vs, which indeede ouerturneth all the chiefe grounds and principles of your sect. Be ashamed therefore to oppose your selues so wickedly against the cleare doctrine of Christ, and cease to imagine absurdities, which are but from your blind mistaking. Agayne we see that

our Sauiour healing a man that had the Leprosie, commaunded him, saying, goe shew thy selfe vnto the Priest, and offer that gift which Moses hath commaunded for a testimony vnto them, Math. 8.4. Also he sendeth ten Leapers at once to shew themselues to the Priests, Luk. 17.14. which were also to offer according to the law. And this was not long before he suffered. You do very fondly imagine, þ if the Priests, the Scribes and Pharisies and Saduces, and the multitude which clane vnto them were the visible Church, then were there two Churches, vnles we will denie that our Sauiour & his Disciples were the Church. For at þ time they were all in the same visible Church euen those open wicked and the good. Our Sauiour doth reprehend them and layeth open their wickednes, to the end that men might beware and not be seduced and kept from truth by them. But why are they not cast forth? The Prophets in olde time did sharply reprehend the wicked of all sorts in the Church, but they had not the ordinary power to execute the censure of excommunication, no more had our Sauiour himselfe.

There be diuers testimonies and examples of the holy scriptures which I alledged to proue this thing which you knitte vp short, but in your other booke you deale in them at large. And because Master Caluine hath written strongly and plentifully in these matters against the Anabaptists, and such as most wickedly did condemne the Churches in his time, you take vpon you to confute him, as if he were the author of these things, and you tearme vs his wretched disciples. Whereas in very deede M. Caluine followeth but the steps of the auncient writers, Augustine and the rest against the Catharists and Donatists. And you lighting into their Tents, set very freshly vpon the worke euen as a chiefe Captayne, to repayre and fortifie the ruines of that auncient Catharisme and Donatisme, and yet can bring nothing which they brought not.

Touching the reformation by Princes, which compell their subiects that profesle Christ, and haue the seale of the couenant, to forsake Idolatrie, and to imbrace the holy word and Sacraments, I haue spoken before: and therefore I come to the 17. page of your booke, where you write after this sort: The next

shiftes these Balaamities haue for the administring vnto, and Communicating with, and retaining the prophane in the bosome of their church: are certaine arguments drawne by Master Caluine, from Matth. 13. against the Annabaptists, comparing the church to a corne field, where the good seed, and the bad grow together, to a net, and in Matth. 3. To a floar where the corne and the chaffe lye together.

Indeed Master Barrow these were speciall places which the auncient Fathers stood vpon against the Donatists, and Master Caluine against the Annabaptists, and which we in as great right vrge against you and your sect. If we bee Balaamites, then what was Master Caluine, what was Augustine and all the rest? Against whome haue you powred forth your railings? Take heede it be not against our Lord Iesus himselfe, being against his expresse word: for let vs see how you can auoyde these places. Touching the parable of the seed, you oppose (as you say) against Master Caluine and his Disciples, first the interpretation of our Sauiour himselfe: who saith not that the field is the Church, but the field is the world. And so the good seed and the bad are together in the world, but not in the Church. And then you shew an absurditie of flat contradiction of the holy Scriptures which would follow, if we take it that the good seed and the bad should grow together in the Church. The contradiction is this, there is power and commaundement giuen to the Church to cast forth the open wicked, and here he bids let them alone. Therefore this let them alone, let them grow together vntil the haruest, must needs be expounded let them alone, and let them grow together in the world, but not in the Church.

In deed your exposition Master Barrow, is the very same which the Donatists made, and obstinately stoode vpon. The field is the world, our Sauiour hath said it, the truth hath saide it, accursed be he that shal gainesay it: but to gather from hence, that the good seed and the bad shal not be together in the church but in the world, is directly to ouerthrow the whole parable. For first, what is it which is resembled or likened? The words are plaine, it is the Kingdome of Heauen. The Kingdome of

Heauen

Heauen saith he is like, &c. What is it which is here called the Kingdome of Heauen, is the world so called? Who dare say so? It is the Church, in which there is the Gospell of the Kingdome, and in which Christ doth raigne. If our Sauiour had ment to set forth, and to resemble the state of the world by the good seed and the bad mingled together (as he saith) the enemy did sow the tares, *ana mesō ton siton*, in the middest or among the wheate, and that they grew vp together) or to say looke how in a field good seede and bad grow together, so in the world good men and bad: it could not then be saide, the Kingdome of Heauen is like, but the state of the world is like. Was it euer heard of, that a man would expound a parable, that is a similitude, and exclude that which is resembled by the similitude? For if the good seed and the bad, sowen and growing together in the field, do not resemble and set forth the state of the visible church, while it is also in the field, that is to say in this world, mingled of good and bad men, shew what there is in the whole parable, whereunto the Kingdome of Heauen is likened. Moreouer in the exposition of the parable our Sauiour saith, as the tares are gathered and burned, so shall it be in the end of this world, the sonne of man shall send his Angels, which shall gather out of his Kingdome all offences, and those which worke iniquitie, &c. If they shall be gathered out of his Kingdome, which is his Church (peculiarly so called, though he be Lord of Heauen and earth) then are they vntill the end of the world in his Church. I doubt not Master Barrow, but that simple men, yea poore Children (looking vpon this parable, and considering what it is likened, and how Christ doth expound it) shall bee able to see what a spirit of giddines God hath in iudgement cast vpon yee, for the loftines of your mindes. And now for that absurdity of flat contradiction in the Scriptures, which you imagine, if wee expound it that the good and the bad shall bee mingled in the church, so long as it is in the field. There is no such thing, as I will shew by as great an absurdity which will follow of ỳ sense which you giue, for speaking of the wicked in the Church, if he should say let them alone, it would ouerthrow the censures Ecclesiasticall which are expressely commaunded: then speaking

of

of the wicked in the world, and saying let them alone, let them grow together, least ye pluck vp the wheat, it should ouerthrow the power of Kings and rulers, in putting euil doers to death, which is expressely commaunded: for I trust Master Barrow ye will not deny Christian Kings to be one part of the seruants of the master of the house. Then whereas you reason thus, the power of excommunication which is giuen to the Church, and which the Church is commaunded to execute, may not be ouerthrowne: but if Christ will to let the tares grow in the Church, he forbiddeth to execute that power, and soit is ouerthrowne, therefore he doth not speake of open wickednes in the Church, but in the world.

I will reason agaynst your exposition thus. The power which God hath giuen vnto the ciuill Magistrates to put murtherers and other wicked malefactors to death, is not to be ouerthrowne: but if Christ will men to let the wicked ones in the world alone, & will haue thē grow to the harueſt, least in plucking them vp they destroy the wheate, hee taketh away that power from the Magistrates. Therefore this parable must not bee taken of the good and the bad together in the world. And mark how he sayth not, let them alone, because it belongeth not vnto ye, but let them alone least ye pluck vp the wheate. What then? shall we neither take it of the Church nor of the world, because of an absurditie which seemeth to followe on either side? Of the world indeed it cannot bee taken, as I haue shewed before, because he sayth, not the world is like, but the kingdome of heauen is like, but of the Church it is sayd, that as the good seede and the bad are sowen and grow together vntill harueſt in the mans field, so the good and bad men are mixed in the Church so long as it remayneth in the world. How then for these words, let them alone, let them growe vnto the harueſt? It is plaine (if we will auoyd absurdities on both sides) that our Sauiour doth not here meddle either with the Ciuill or Ecclesiasticall power, but as it is the manner in parables to vtter some sayings which are onely to shew some poynt of doctrine, & not to be taken strictly according to the letter. As for example, when our Sauiour would shew in that place Luk. 16. which is partly a parable, that

such as cannot be brought to repentance by hearing Moses and the Prophets, will not repent if one should rise from the dead to bring in this doctrine, the damned soule is sayd to intreate Abraham that hee would send Lazarus vnto his fathers house to warne his brethren, least they should come into that place. Shall we think that damned soules haue such a care that others may repent and be saued? May, as I sayd, it is onely to bring in a doctrine. What is the doctrine then which our Sauiour doth bring in by these words, let them alone, let them grow together vnto the haruest? This it is, that when the Christian Princes haue done what they can in reforming the Church, and put the wicked malefactors to death: and when the censures ecclesiasticall bee most diligently and wisely executed, yet will there bee heapes of vngodly ones in the Church, and that seeing it cannot be auoyded, men are not to make Schismes, and so to rend vp the wheate, but meekly to expect the haruest when the full separation shall be made. Be not therefore (Master Barrow) so absurd, as by an imagined absurditie, to ouerthrowe the doctrine of a parable so cleerely expressed.

The next place to proue that the open wicked shall alwayes be mixed with the good in the Church is the parable of the draw net out of the same chapter. You say this is graunted to be vnderstood of the planted Church. Who are they which graunted this? Indeed the Donatists granted this, and it is some gentlenes that you will graunt so much. For if in this parable the kingdome of heauen be the visible Church, which is compared to the net which draweth together good and bad: why is not the kingdome of heauen in the former parable, also the Church, and so the estate therof likened while it is in the field, vnto the wheat and the tares growing together? You say the euil fishes are not open sinners but hypocrites, and so sayd the Donatists. And I meruaile you shewe no reason for it, seeing the diuell did suggest this friuolous shewe of reason vnto the Donatists, that hypocrites are very fitly resembled by fishes in the net vnder the water, which the fisher men cannot see vntill the net bee drawne to land. This I haue answered in my former booke. There is no doubt but that close hypocrites which outwardly appeare holy,

are

are one great part of those euill fishes which the net of the Gospell draweth together: but to exclude all the rest, there is no reason.

The place in Math. 3. He shall purge his floar and gather the wheate into his barne, but hee will burne the chaffe with vnquenchable fire, dooth manifestly shewe, that as the corne and chaffe for a time lye vppon the floar, so the good and the bad lye mingled together in the visible Church. Here you make an exposition of your owne, and then take on grieuously that Christs Church should be compared to such a floar as the chaffe and the corne lye together. And aske what the Church then differeth from the world? It is certaine that both the ciuill and ecclesiasticall power ought to bee imployed with all diligence and care that may bee to purge the Church: that albeit the floar cannot be cleane rid of the chaffe, yet it may bee rid so farre as men are able. That is not the question: but when these duties of men haue been neglected, and that there be heapes of chaffe in which the graynes of corne do lye couered, whether it bee not still the visible Church? It is a most cléere case that in the Church of Israel, which at that time was the visible Church, there were very great heapes of chaffe, and very fewe graynes of good corne in comparison of the whole multitude. Iohn Baptist threatneth eternall iudgement vnto those hypocrites, wicked and faithlesse people, shewing that the place they held in the Church for a time should nothing helpe, seeing the Lord will fanne them out like chaffe, which for a time lyeth with the corne, but defileth not the corne, nor cannot turne it into chaffe. You thinke you haue great hold that hee speaketh of separating the chaffe from the corne: but answere this one question, was it not his floar, that is his visible Church out of which he would purge the chaffe? Dooth he make it his floar by purging it, or was it his floar before it was purged? The words are cléere, hee shall purge his floar, &c. whether the open wicked pollute the holy things of God, or the conscience of the faithfull which do communicate with them, I referre the reader to those things which I haue noted betwéene the ancient Churches and the Donatists, where euery thing hath been as strongly vrged by those Donatists, as

you are able, or any of your sect. Seeing then in your second accusation your grounds and reasons are flat Donatisme, & that in your blind furie you condemne all Churches both of auncient time, and in these dayes, most deepely reuiling and rayling at all the most excellent instruments which God hath raised vp vnto his Church, what remayneth, but to warne simple men to take heed they bee not seduced by you? Thus much for the second, now to the third accusation.

The third accusation is, that we haue a false Antichristian ministrie imposed, &c.

IN your former writings, where ye came to deale about our ministrie, ye were in a great displeasure (hauing made so great a chalenge) for that I did intercept this busines frō the hands of the learned, vnto whome (ye say) it did by many rights more neerely appertayne then vnto me. I made answere to this, that in very deede it is no reason, that such as you should be encountred by men of great learning: because in all your dooings, yee are so full of false accusations, so rash, so presumptuously bold in powring forth without any discretion, whatsoeuer lighteth into your brayn: ye are so miserably ignorant, so full of foule errors, being altogether vnlearned (this onely excepted, that yee haue scraped some things out of other mens writings, which yet ye peruert) that all wise men, both of learned and vnlearned, doo playnely see, it is but mad frensie, by which yee are led. For let the things which I haue noted out of these your last bookes witnesse vnto all, I will not say the learned (for what should they spend time about them) but to all the Artificers and husbandmen which haue any sound knowledge, whether I haue in this charged ye with more then is true.

Ye would beare the Reader in hand, that the learned men doo abstayne from dealing with ye, because they know our cause is bad, and that it is better therefore it should be raked vp, then appeare the worse by the handling.

Ye sayd moreouer, that if I haue consulted with my learned

Brethren, they would haue giuen me counsell not to write, but to deale in the pulpit, where it may bee without controulment: least the fowlenes of things should appeare.

To one part of this I made answere, that whereas yee doo imagine that all the learned are afrayd ye would be too hard for them, if they should deale with yee, and therefore they doo not nor dare not meddle, it is nothing so. But as one among the beasts (ye know of whome it is sayd) had gotten a Lyons skinne vpon him, and went about and frayed all the simpler beasts: vntill one more subtill, whether he espied the long eares, or whether he heard him bray (which is nothing like the roaring of a Lion) made answere, that otherwise indeede, hee should haue beene scared as well as the rest. For you comming with a most terrible outcrie against our Church, ye wil nedes haue vs think the Lion roareth. Let not the Reader suppose that I speake this vpon mine owne conceipt: for in the fourth page of the Epistle of your other booke, which ye call A briefe discouery of the false Church, ye haue set it downe so your selues. Ye would not haue those dreadfull things which ye denounce lesse feared, because they are pronounced by a fraple man: but would haue vs all know that the Lyon roareth, and that the Lyon roareth not in the Forrest if no pray be present. Doubtles your voyce hath beene terrible, and especially at the first you scared many of the simpler sorte, which tooke it to bee the roaring of a Lyon: But ye must vnderstand that the learned euen at the first did discerne the voyce not to be the roaring of a Lion, but the braying of him that put on the Lyons skinne. Therfore ye are much deceiued in thinking they all feare and tremble at it. They see playnely that it is but mad frensie, and so they disdayne to deale with it. And for mine owne parte, if I did not see what hauock the Donatists made, how many the Annabaptists seduced, and how weake much of our people are, I should count it great folly to giue you anie answere.

And now, whereas I did require if there bee any spark of modestie left in ye, to make some colourable shew, that the learned would councell not to deale in these matters, which they knowe can not bee defended, but by the discussing will become

more obious: this ye make answere. That these preachers had taken this course (say you) among themselues, we know certaynely, by a letter that two of the chiefe of them sent vnto vs, denying that conference which they had before promised, because we denyed their Church and ministrie. After that, two of them being procured to our prison, denied to deale with vs concerning those exceptions we made against their church and ministrie, alleadging that they were forbidden by their brethren to deale with vs in those matters. To be short, what else can with any probabilitie be coniectured to bee the hindrance of the first company of preachers, that at the first sent vnto vs to know the causes of our dislike, promising to assent, or to shew vnto vs the causes why they could not, that they vpon the sight of that little paper, (wherein we set downe vnto them the causes of our separation from these parish assemblies, as also what we purposed in our owne assemblies) neuer as yet could be drawne to make any answere in writing or conference, if not that they perceiued, that they were neither able to defend their estate, neither yet had fayth to leaue it for feare of persecution and danger.

Who can now doubt but that Master Barrow and Master Greenewood be honest simple dealing men? Who can say they haue slaundred the learned, or that they haue vttered any thing rashly, when they now affirme that they did for certainty know that the preachers had taken such a course among themselues, and alleadge such proofe for the certaintie hereof, as no man needeth to doubt of ꝑ matter. For will any man bee so impudent as to lie, and to publish it to those which do know he doth lye? I haue heard Master Barrow, by such as haue dealt with yee, that ye make no conscience of lying, and nowe it falleth out so here: for one of those which came to the prison, comming to the sight of your booke, hath set downe in the margent that ye make a most shameles lie. It may be in this ye will stand vpon your Pantofles, it is but your yea, and his nay. But for the letter you speake of which the other two whome ye name, sent vnto ye: I haue talked with them both, to knowe why they denied conference, and what they had written. They say they denied

conference

conference with ye, onely because yee denied them to be Chri-
stians, to pray with them, and that ye denied all the preachers
in the land to bee Christians and all those which ioyne with
them: not hoping that ye could take any fruit by their writings
which would not yeeld to receiue any fruite or comfort by their
prayers. I take it Master Barrow you haue the letter. If you
haue it, shew it vnto some honest man that may speake for you
and defend ye, not to be past shame in forging such a sense. If
ye haue it not, I can let ye haue the perfect copie of it, and will
let any friend ye haue see it. They are so far off in the letter from
giuing the least suspition that they doubt of our Church and
ministrie, as that they pronounce it your heathenish opinion,
whereby ye denie vs to be Christians. What preachers sent
vnto ye I know not, but that they refrayned to haue conference
with ye, perceiuing vpon the sight of your little paper (as yee
say) that they could not defend their estate, doe yee indeede
think still, that they tooke it to be the roaring of a Lyon? could
they not discerne (thinke ye) betweene *rudere* and *rugire*?

Your multitudes, and armies of wolues (being but vayne
tanglings) I will passe by, and come directly to the substance
of the matter. And because our ministrie is ordayned by Bi-
shops (which is by one part of their gouernement) your third
and fourth accusation, shall bee handled toynly, as it were vn-
der one.

In page 104. Ye wonder (as ye say) that in this florishing
estate of our Church, which ouerfloweth with so great learn-
ing, aboundeth with so many writers, that not one of them
should vndertake to proue the ministry of their Church di-
rectly by the rules of Gods word, in their office, entrance, ad-
ministration, and maintenance.

These may very well be some of those swelling words of va-
nitie, which Saint Peter speaketh of, for who (if he know not
before the vaine insolencie of Master Barrow and his fellow)
reading this wonder, would not iudge them to bee men very
deepely read? Haue they not read ouer (thinke ye) all the learn-
ed writers of this age, wondring that there is not one among
them all, that hath vndertaken to proue our ministrie directly by
the

the rules of Gods word? Is it not pitty that there be no moe learned writers, that these men might search them also, to haue this poynt handled? If you haue now done wondring Master Barrow, giue vs leaue a little to wonder. The Papists denying that the churches which haue reiected popery haue any ministry, and requiring proofe thereof, many learned writers, both of other Churches, and of our owne nation, haue vndertaken this matter, and haue so directly proued our ministry by the rules of Gods word, as that the Papists haue no cause to glorie. Now there be two things here which we may wonder at: the one how it should be possible, that such swelling insolency could be found in the hearts of men grosely ignorant, as that hauing read almost nothing, and vnderstanding lesse by sundry degrees, yet openly vaunt, as if they had read all, and could finde no such matter. The other how men of so contrarie disposition, should vse the very same weapon against the Church, for this is one weapon of the Papists, and now in your hands, Ye haue no ministrie of Christ.

If the reader shal here thinke that I grate too hard vpon Master Barrow, who directeth his speech but against the ministry of our Church: the matter is farre otherwise, as I will make it appeare: for first he denieth the ministry of all Churches in expresse words: affirming that there is no ministry in all Europe, nor in all these knowne parts of the world. Secondly, we are to note, that although the reformed Churches do differ, sundry of them each from others, in the manner of the calling and ordination of ministers, yet the defence which the learned writers do make, is generally for the ministry of all those Churches (as well for the ministry of the Church of England, as of others) which haue forsaken Antichrist, and preach the Gospell. Therefore Master Barrow, read all the learned writers which haue stood to maintaine against the Papists, that Master Luther, Master Caluine, Master Bucer, Martyr & the rest, were ministers of Christ, and seeing ye will needs fight against God and his truth, try your strength, and see how ye can gratifie the Church of Rome, in ouerthrowing that which all her learnedest patrons are not able to shake more then they be a-

ble

ble to shake or remoue a mountaine.

The ministry of our Church is not (you say) the ministry of the Gospell, or the ministry of Christ, but the ministry of Antichrist, comming in the life and power of the beast. Your reason is that we are the children of the Bishops, & the Bishops are the creatures of the Pope.

Against this I did alleage, that the popish Bishops haue their consecration and power from the Pope, they sweare obedience vnto him, to maintaine his dignity, religion, lawes, and ceremonies. And also with him doo exercise a power ouer the faith and conscience of men. But the Bishops of the Church of England, haue not their ordination, consecration, or power from the Pope, but from our Church which hath renounced Antichrist. The Bishops of England, acknowledge no subiection to the Pope, but by an oath, haue renounced his vsurped power and tyranny. The Bishops of England are not ordayned to vphold and maintaine the religion or lawes of Antichrist, but quite contrary they promise and professe, to aduaunce the Gospell of Iesus Christ, &c. They vsurpe not a Lordship ouer the faith and conscience of men.

Let vs see now what ye bring against this, It helpeth not our Bishops (ye say) any thing, that they haue broken their faith and Schismed from the Pope, & renounced his yoake, euen his vsurped power and tyrannie, seeing they vsurpe and retaine (if not the same) yet as Antichristian and enormous a power as the Pope, exercising their authoritie and commaundements contrary vnto, and aboue all lawes, both of God and of their prince, page 113.

If it be thus our case is hard: but Master Barrow remember the old Prouerb, a lier needeth to haue a good memorie, for in page 181. and 182. you haue quite forgotten what ye had set downe here, for there yee doo affirme, that the Bishops which died for the Gospell were godly blessed Martyres, of whose happie and blessed estate ye doo not doubt. Your reason is, for that they were not conuinced, but did exercise that power ignorantly.

I pray ye tell me Master Barrowe, could they bee godly and

had but broken their faith and Schisined from the Pope? Could they be godly men, exercising as Antichristian and enormous a power as the Pope? Yea could they bee true christians, exercising their commaundementes and power, contrary vnto, and aboue all lawes both of God and man? Or could ignorance excuse them in these matters? Then tell vs why the Pope might not be a good Christian also, before he was conuinced? Which way dooth the wheele turne now Master Barrow? Ye can neuer be able to bring both ends together in these, yee must either condemne those Martyrs, or else make the gouernement by Bishops, not such as you set it forth: well let vs proceede. Here now we must lay open what power the Pope dooth exercise, and what power the Bishops in our Church doo exercise, to see if it be the same, or the like. Also whether the Bishops doo exercise any power, but that which Christ hath giuen to his Church, to be exercised by men, that is either by Bishops, or Presbyteries. Touching the Pope, he hath vsurped power ouer the whole word of God, affirming that the holy scriptures haue no authority (as they say vnto vs) no certainty for the sense, no life, but as hee doth giue vnto them. And for this cause hee doth take vpon him to expound them as he will, contrary to the grammer sense. Hee doth take vpon him to dispense with all, and to abrogate expresse lawes of God. And further he taketh vpon him to make lawes of his owne, to bind the fayth and conscience of all men, euen as the articles of our fayth doo bind, or the expresse doctrine of the sacred Scriptures. Hee doth vsurp in sundry things of so high nature, apperteining peculiarly to God, as that he sheweth himselfe as God.

The power which the Bishops of our Church do exercise, is first, in examining, approuing and ordaining ministers and authorising them to preach the Gospell. Secondly, it is in this, that they are to see the orders of the Church, for the publick administration duly obserued, and so they haue power to excommunicate, suspend and depriue, &c. such as shall transgresse either against doctrine, order, or in manners. Touching lawes, they haue not power to make any one, not euen in things meere indifferent, neither haue they power to abrogate, or to take a-

way

way any one that is made, and by the publick authority of our Church established: they can giue no commaundements of their owne. That Christ hath giuen power to ordaine ministers, and to execute the censures Ecclesiastically, you doo not call into question: the controuersie is but, by whome this power should bee executed, whether by Bishops or by Presbyters. If there be an error in the execution of it by Bishops, or if there be a fault in the execution by Elders, this fault or error dooth not destroy the power it selfe, nor yet maketh it Antichristian, as ruling ouer the faith and conscience.

I knowe Master Barrow, that ye will here take great exception, and say that the chiefe thing is yet behind. For as ye charge the presbyteries most heynously, in that they take vpon them to decree and ordayne Canons and constitutions, vnto which they inioyne obedience in the people: so the Bishops execute the lawes and Canons which haue been ordeyned by men (though not by themselues) the matter is all one. Is not this to exercise Lordship and dominion ouer mens faith and conscience? About this then must be our speciall question, whether Christ hath giuen such a power vnto the Church, as to make lawes or Cannons in externall matters, which wee call things indifferent? And whether the vrging men to keepe them, be not to take away Christian libertie, and so to rule ouer the faith and conscience? I knowe this question is hard to bee discussed, to make euery simple man vnderstand the matter. You (Master Barrow and Master Greenwood) are most blind in it. I wish the reader to obserue, because it is one maine rocke vpon which ye are runne. And crye out what ye can, that I like a marked seruant of Antichrist, like a graceles man, that hath his conscience seared with a hot Iron, do change pee wrongfully: yet it shall bee euident, that by seeking an Annabaptisticall freedome, ye do abridge the power of the Christian Magistrate, and of the Church.

To come therefore vnto the matter: that which S. Iames sayth must first stand sure, namely, *That there is one lawgiuer which is able to saue and to destroy.* Iam. 4. vers. 12. Hereupon it is most sure that God alone hath Lordship ouer the conscience of man to binde the faith and conscience. For looke what God hath

by his lawe commaunded to bee done, it is good, it is holie: no King, nor the whole Church can make any part of it euill, or commaund it not to be done. Looke what God hath forbidden to be done, that same is euill and vnholy; no King, nor yet the whole Church can make it good and holy, or command it to bee done. I say further, that the law of God is so absolutely perfect, that there is no righteousnes for men, but it is therein conteyned: neyther is there any vnrighteousnes, but it is therein forbidden. Wherefore they which take vpon them to make lawes to binde the conscience eyther by abrogating or by adding, commit most high and blasphemous sacrilege, of which the whole poperie is to be condemned. But now there are certayne middle actions, and things, which we call indifferent, because if we simply respect them in themselues, or in their owne nature, they bee neither good nor euill. In these consisteth one part of Christian libertie to vse or not to vse with knowledge and discretion. Now if we respect ẏ very nature of these things, no Prince or church can change it, as to make them to become necessarily good, or necessarily euill in themselues to the conscience. And therefore, *touch not, taste not, handle not*, Coloss. 2. vers. 21. making the outward indifferent things vncleane to the conscience, is to vsurpe an Antichristian power ouer the conscience euen agaynst God. Also to make those externall things to be of necessitie to the conscience, is to lay a yoake of bondage: and agaynst this wee are willed *to stand fast in the freedome wherewith Christ hath made vs free*, Gal 5. vers. 1. Hetherto (Master Barrow) I thinke yee will agree with me. But now touching the externall vse of these things, either for Princes to make politick lawes to commaund the vse or to restraine the vse of them, or for the Church to make Cannons and constitutions to commaund or restrayne the vse as shall serue for order and comelines, therein lieth our disagreement, and therein ye pleade for your Annabaptisticall freedome, and confusion, I meane that ataxia, or ouerthrowe of all order.

First, ye call it a subtill distinction which Master Caluine vseth, of the externall or ciuill Court, and the Court of conscience, in your discouerie pag. 88. And you say Master Caluine hauing very truely set downe, that it is heinous presumption in

any

any mortall man to restrayne or make lawes of such things as the Lord hath left in libertie: hee straight way (least he should keepe backe ciuill Magistrates from receiuing the Gospell) inuenteth a politick distinction, betwixt the ciuill court, and the court of conscience: saying, that this outward court respecteth men onely, and bindeth not the conscience of the doer, the other concerneth matters belonging vnto God, and therefore bindeth the conscience. Thus hath he both lost and entangled himselfe, and vtterly ouerthrowne all his former doctrine. pag. 93. In pag. 247. of this booke agaynst me, Master Greenwood sayth, that Master Caluin would but diuide the soule and the bodie in ciuill causes, but I would goe a note further.

Thus farre be your wordes. How shall Master Caluine doo that is thus set vpon by such great diuines, which haue so pursued him that he hath lost himselfe, and they haue snared him in his owne wordes? Alas poore soules, I cannot but lament with pitie to see your blindenes, for I knowe this is of meere ignorance, that ye cannot vnderstand Master Caluine in a doctrine which yet is cleare by the Scriptures. Ye say he inuented this politique distinction of the ciuill court and the court of conscience, least he should keepe Princes back from the Gospell. Then by your owne words it doth follow, that if it be prooued that Princes haue power in such matters to make lawes, ye do foully abridge their sacred power by denying it. And for that Master Greenwood saith I go a note further then M. Caluine, it is his ignorance: for let him reade well the fourth booke of his institutions, and he shall finde hee holdeth this distinction not onely in ciuill causes, but in ecclesiasticall canons. And now to the matter. I would I were able though in neuer so rude speech, to lay it so open as that a childe might vnderstand. I will doe the best I can: and I will come vnto it by degrees. Ye cannot see how there should be such a distinction of an externall action to respect men, and not to binde the conscience before God: Mark well and see. There bee sundry sortes of cloath of sundry colours, and there be sundry fashions of garments. I am a minister of the Gospell, I haue by mee a yelow gowne, a greene hat, white hose, a tawny coate, I doo for some neede

secretly where no man seeth me, vse them: my conscience is not polluted by them, I sinne not. But now I come with these garments into the publique assemblie, I sinne grieuously. What is the reason of this? It is because the garments themselues, the colours or fashions which were before God to the conscience of man indifferent, are now altered and become not indifferent to the conscience before God? In no wise. For betweene God and the conscience, they remayne as they did. But now the whole matter lyeth in this: it is vncomely and offensiue before men. Who cannot here see the distinction betweene the ciuill court, that is for the action before men: and the court of conscience before God? Will ye say because it is euill for a man to doo thus before men, therefore it is euill to his conscience before God, euen for the very dooing, not respecting men? Might I not alleadge a thousand things of this nature, which I may doo and no sinne betweene God and my conscience, but the sinne commeth by the sight and view of men? Nowe when the sight and view of men doth restraine me from dooing them openly, the freedome of my conscience in them is not taken away before God, or my conscience is not bound by them before God: but I am restrayned in the externall vse of them before men, because they be not expedient; they be lawfull, but not comely. We see how Saint Paul speaketh about this matter, 1, Cor. 10 ver. 23. 24. *All things are lawfull for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawfull, but all things doo not edifie.* This is meant onely of things indifferent, for all which are in their owne nature euil, be vnlawfull, and all things simply good are expedient: and doo edifie. Then we see by this there are things which are lawful vnto our conscience before God, and in which our conscience retayneth still her freedome before God, euen when we are restrayned the outward vse before men. This we may see further in the same Chapter, *eate what is set before ye, asking no question for conscience. But if any say this was offered to Idoles, eate not of it for conscience. Conscience I say, not thine, but of that other.* When he sayth not thine, doth hee not shew his conscience remayneth free before God, euen when he is restrayned before men? And when he sayth, *All things are lawfull,*

but

but I will not be brought vnder the power of any thing: 1. Cor. 6. vers. 12. doth he not shew it is some bondage, if a man haue not freedome to restrayne the vse of a thing lawfull? This is one steppe towards our matter: But what is this for making lawes either politique or ecclesiasticall to inioyne men to doo that which God hath left free, or to restrayn the vse of the creatures which hee hath graunted libertie to vse? This is your mayne reason Master Barrow. I haue already shewed that he which shall enioyne or restrayne, to lay it vpon the conscience before God, committeth high sacrilege: But the vse of things may be enioyned or restrayned in respect of men, as shall bee profitable or vnprofitable, comely, or vncomely, &c. A good part of a kingdome doth consist of Cappers. The people are giuen all to weare Hats, and by this meanes those subiects doo fall into pouertie. The Prince maketh a law, that all his subiects shall at certaine times not weare Hats, but Capps. If the subiect shall now stand vp & say, to weare an Hat or a Cappe is free before God, and seeing God hath giuen mee freedome of conscience to vse or not to vse, no mortall creature hath power to binde my conscience. Will not the Prince make answere, thou foolish man, I doo not binde thy conscience in the thing before God, but I enioyne it as a thing expedient and profitable to my common wealth? It is free for a man to eate any kinde of meate. The Prince doth see it profitable that some kindes of meate should be spared, and therfore doth make a law that at some times men shall abstayne from the same. The Subiects shall make aunswere, GOD hath giuen vs freedome of conscience to eate, no power can binde our conscience from it, GOD hath made it lawfull and free. Will not the Prince make answere and say: ye Annabaptists doo ye not knowe that there bee many things lawfull and free to the conscience before God, which yet are not expedient among men? I doo not restrayne ye to take away the freedome of your conscience in it before God: but it is profitable to my kingdome. It is free for a man that hath grounds to sowe or to graze: but if men be giuen wholly to grazing, and corne ware deare, and the Prince maketh a law that whosoeuer occupieth such a quantitie

of

of ground, shall plow thus many acres, doth he now binde the conscience, or onely seeke the publike profite?

There be thousands of such like matters Maker Barrow: and therefore consider how foully ye do abridge the power of Princes, to the ouerthrowe of Common wealths, in denying them authoritie to make permanent lawes, in things indifferent. But ye make one obiection more which is of some shewe: and that is that princes lawes are to be obeyed for conscience: out of which a man may reason thus; seeing none can make lawes to binde the conscience but God: and no lawe but in things good or euill can binde the conscience, and not in things indifferent, for that were to binde where God hath left free: therefore Princes haue no power to make lawes in things indifferent. To answer this in such sort as a simple man may see the falsehood of it, is somewhat hard: but I will do the best I can. I say therefore I am bound for conscience to obey the Princes lawes, and yet the Princes lawes of themselues, do not binde my conscience. It is an honest, a good, and profitable thing, when the Prince maketh a lawe and restrayneth the vse of some things outwardly, which the conscience hath freedome in inwardly before God, when it is for a publike good. Now I am bound to further a publike good, it is a great sinne to shewe contempt against the Prince whom God commandeth me to obey: in these respects then I am bound euen for conscience to keep the lawes. The nature of the things indifferent is not altered before God vnto my conscience by that restaint of lawe: neither yet the vse is taken from me, when and where it may bee without contempt of my Prince, without offence to men, and without hindring a publike good or commoditie. They that speake in words of Arte, doo say that Princes lawes do not binde the conscience *haplôs*, but *cata ti*: not simply by themselues, but for some respect, or by somewhat which commeth as a *medium*: which is as I haue before shewed. Take an example, put case some dying of clothes should be harmefull to the Common wealth, as to dye in blewe: I am a Dyer, this restraynt doth not make the very dying in blew it selfe vncleane to my conscience before God, and so binde my conscience: but if I dye in blew contemning the power, I so giue a publike offence,

and

and hinder a common practice, I doe sinne, God doth forbid these things, and they doe binde the consciences.

Now to come to the lawes Ecclesiasticall, which M. Greenwood sayth is to goe a note further. The Church (as in our Countrey the Prince, the Nobilitie, and Commons assembled in Parliament) do agree vpon some lawes in things indifferent for comelines and order, and edification in Gods worship: as in some other places the Presbyteries, with the consent of the christian Magistrates. This (say you) is to binde the conscience. Well, let vs see your reasons. If (say you) they binde not the conscience, why should men be excommunicate and deliuered vp to Satan, for violating such ceremonies and orders as bind not the conscience? This seemeth vnto you a thing most absurd: but marke a little. The Princes lawes (as I haue shewed) doo not bind the conscience, but yet he that with contempt of the Prince, to a publike euill example, and harme of the Common wealth doth breake the lawes, is guiltie of great sinne, and if he stand in it worthie to be excommunicate. Euen so hee that violateth a lawfull rule or ceremonie of the Church in matters indifferent, which are not layd vpon him to bind his conscience before God, but for order and comelines before men, though his conscience touching the things themselues is not bound before God, yet in shewing any contempt against ỹ publike authoritie of ỹ church, & in giuing an offence, by bringing in vncomelines or disorder, he sinneth, & if he persist obstinatly is to be excommunicate. Tel me M. Greenwood, is it not a thing betweene God and a mans conscience free to weare a gowne of greene cloath, were it not in regard of comelines among men? The Church then taketh order that no Minister shall come into the publike assemblie to preach in a green gown, & he doth it; is he not to be reproued as for a great sinne, & if he stand obstinatly in it to be cast forth? But you say all these things must be left to the discretion of the Minister. So ye may also take away the power of making lawes in matters simply euil: for euery man hath not loue or care. And now whereas I haue shewed by ỹ example of the holy Apostles Act. 15. who decreed that the Gentiles should abstaine from blood and from strangled, that the Church hath power to decree in things indifferent, orders for edification: let vs see what learned answer you (M. Greenwood) haue found out. First, you say

I haue ouerthrowne my selfe by setting downe that the holy Ghost and the Apostles did this, because these were the master builders, and were to make lawes, &c. Alas poore man, doth the holy Ghost euer make law or the Apostles in things indifferent, as eating blood or strangled, to change the nature of the things, or to binde a mans conscience before God, so that he might not secretly where it might neuer be knowne to the weake Iewes? Then ye see there may bee lawes made (the holy Ghost by the rules of the Scriptures guiding the Pastors) in things indifferent, which binde not the conscience. But (say you) they doo not inioyne it as a lawe, but tell them they shall do well if they obserue these things, by no necessitie inforced, pag. 251. Then it seemeth they might haue eate blood and strangled and giuen offence to the weake Iewes and not haue done euill. That which seemeth good to the holy Ghost for them to obserue, they may if it seeme not good to them, not obserue. How absurd is this? And if ye mark well what S. Iames sayth, Act. 21. vers. 25. you shall see it was not left arbytrarie, so long as there might offence growe thereby. Well, if the Church then haue power to make such decrees to auoyd publike offence and disorder; what if the Church erre and appoynt some orders and Ceremonies which are hurtfull? This error and fault of the Church is not in that high offence of binding the conscience, which indeede is Antichristian, but in missing what is most comely, most without offence, and fittest for edification. The Church of Christ is so precious a thing, and the soules of men to bee regarded with such tender compassion, that all Christian gouernours and guides ought to be carefull, not onely, not to lay any poake vppon the conscience, but euen to redresse the least error that may breede or worke any harme touching comelines and order. To ende this poynt, Master Barrow, vntill you can shewe wherein any power is vsurped and exercised ouer the faith and conscience, wee must needes take all that ye haue here set downe, to be but your lauish speech.

Now touching those reasons which I brought to proue the ministry of our Churches, to be ꝑ ministry of Christ. The first is this, *they haue the calling of the Church*. What sound stuffe ye haue brought to warrant your most vngodly presumption, in condemning the Church of England, as also al Churches in Eu-

rope

rope, let the reader iudge. Also that the Churches doo in some things differ about the manner of calling and ordaining ministers, how you or any other by this can proue all to be void, would be seene.

Then next the ministry of the Church of England is the ministry of reconciliation: bringing no doctrine, but the doctrine of the holy Scriptures. Here ye cauill foolishly, that although they exercise an office, yet they hauing no true calling, doo it but as priuate men. Luther and Caluine and all the rest which haue preached the Gospell in these times, ye confesse in some small measure, according to that little which they did see (nothing comparable to that you haue attained) haue uttered the truth: but yet as priuate men. Here besides your wicked barking against the ministry of all Churches, which God hath ratified: your ignorance is to be noted in this, that you do not know, that if a man enter not rightly into a publick office, yet the office it selfe is not destroyed: as if a King haue but usurped the crown, yet he is a King while he be deposed. It is more then foolish that ye say, we haue a leiturgy or prescript forme of prayer, therfore we bring other doctrine besides the Scriptures.

Thirdly, the ministry of the Church of England doth bring men to faith, there being ioyned with it the effectual power and blessing of the holy Ghost, &c. In answering this Master Barrow, yee fall into your former stincking puddle, into which ye draw many a rash ignorant man. I meane ye vtterly deny with the vngodly Swinckfeldians, all the whole efficacy, power and blessing, which God hath annexed vnto the ministry of the Gospell. Here is a great patch set on to help the Papists, how by this also ye say, they may reason to proue their ministry and Church to be such, as they that separate themselues must needs be Schismatikes. Why Master Barrow, do you not know that as God made a promise to his Church to the end of the world, and hath giuen gifts for a ministry, to continue euen to the worlds end, to build it, for Saint Paule saith, *this ministry is giuen, vntill we all meete together in the vnity of faith, which cannot bee, vntill the last day, that the whole number be accomplished.* Ephes. 4.13. So hee hath alwaies reserued not only some ministry in the popery, but also in all times some godly ministers? How little help this bringeth to the Papists, or all those sound points

of doctrine that remained and do remaine among them, to proue that the Churches which haue forsaken them are but Schismatikes, or that the Churches should not cast forth the vsurped power of Antichrist, I thinke children might be made to see and vnderstand, for although they hold sundry points of the faith, yet they quite subuert the holy faith. And whereas the Apostleship and ministry of Saint Paule being called into question, he vseth this reason vnto those which had receaued the faith and power of the holy Ghost by his ministry, *If I be not an Apostle vnto others, yet am I vnto you*: I said the same is to be made the defence of the ministry of the Churches at this day, vnto all such as by the publick preaching of the word, and administration of the Sacraments, are called vnto an assured faith and comfort in God, and vnto vnfeined repentance. For let all these iudge whether there be no efficacy & power, in the publick administratiō of the word and Sacraments, more then from the mouth of any priuat person. Vnto this your answer is too foule and beastly: for ye say it wil fit the Papists against vs: and then I say it might fit the false Apostles against S. Paule. For if the Papists can or may as well say, though wee bee no ministers of Christ vnto other, yet vnto you that feele the comfort and power of our doctrine and ioy in it, we are ministers of Christ. Then might the false Apostles in like manner haue risen vp against S. Paul, and spoken the same vnto those which delighted to heare them. Is there no difference betweene that power of the Gospell, that assurance of faith, of peace and ioy in the holy Ghost, and of vnfained feare of God, and repentance which it worketh: and that blinde zeale, and comfort which hereticks and Papists haue in false doctrine and superstition? Will ye confound all? When ye pronounce that there is no such faith nor repentance, nor ioy in the holy Ghost, nor peace of conscience wrought in the hearts of any by the ministry of our Church: how far aboue the clouds doth your swelling blind pride, lift vp her hands? Let al such as haue felt the effectual calling of God, beare witnes in this matter.

In the fourth, I alledged that the Martyrs which suffered in the dayes of Quéene Marie, were moued and brought to fayth & repentance, at the preaching of Master Latimer, Taylor, Hoper, Bradford, and others. Your replie is, that this reason standeth vpon popish and Annabaptisticall grounds. For po-

with ye do alledge, that the Pope hath had as many martyrs his predecessors. Let me shed a fewe words vpon this question: when it is confessed that they were holy martyrs, & died for the true faith, will it not follow, if the Pope could proue that the Church of Rome had held still that holy fayth, that it should bee the true Church? We hold the same fayth with the holy Martyrs. The motions ye say at our preachings are but the illusiõs of Sathan, and this is the cause that you accoũt the reason to be Annabaptisticall. God is highly to be blessed, who hath so ratified the effectual power of the ministrie of his word in the hearts of many thousands, both in this land and in other countries with such assurance and constancie of faith, that the whole power of Sathã out of the mouthes of papists, Annabaptists, Schismatiks, and frantick persons, is not able to bring it into doubt. Lastly, I did aduise men to be somewhat moued with the iudgement of other Churches. This (you say) is an old popish reason. M. Barrow it is not popish at all vnto such as shall consider that the Churches with these principal instruments which God rayseth vp as lights, doo discusse matters by the Scriptures: men are to seeke for the truth at their handes. But I must tell yee it is the trick of all ranck heretikes and schismatiks to despise the iudgement of the Churches. Shall we think that a few ignorant rash men haue receiued such light from God, as al the most noble instruments raysed vp, haue not? Thus ye haue answered no one reason which I brought, but only with raile, yea more then vayne cauills.

The foule reproachfull speeches, which yee vse to deface all the ministers of Christs Gospell, both of other Churches, & of the Church of England, are so many, and that in sundry places of your bookes, but specially in your Discouery, from pag. 140. vnto pag. 187. that hee that will search all that is written of the Catharists, the Donatists & Annabaptists, and sundry heretiks, shall not be able to finde the like, for the slanderous presumption, & prowd contempt. The preaching of the Gospel it selfe, in our church ye do most prophanely blaspheme, in saying, that therwith, as with a goodly embrodered couerlet and fine sheets of Egipt, we couer Iesabels bed, & hide al our fornicatiõs. When ye say it is as a sweet whistle & as a charme, yea when ye tearme it the whores fearles to couer her shame, pag.

141. Also wher as in many places of this land, but chiefly when the Spaniards came to inuade, there were fasts, & the word of God preached in some places by two, in some by 3. ministers: this ye call a stage play. pag. 97. Ye say ye are no Donatists nor Schismaticks, & out of that which I haue written to shewe that ye are full Donatists, ye gather sundry dissimilitudes betwixt your selues and them. Ye might perhaps by diligence finde out some other things in which ye are not like them: as it may be they did weare blew caps, or greene cloaks, which ye doe not. The truth is you do agree with thē in the sum & substance of all ꝑ fowlest things, which ye cannot denie: at least if ye come behinde them in any one poynt, ye are before them in two other for it. To follow ye in all points wherin ye erre either with thē. or with some other as wicked, would be ouer tedious: onely I note these and set them downe together.

1 First that ye do most presumptuously against the expresse rules of Gods word, intrude your selues into the Lords office, in taking vpon ye to condemne the whole Church of *England*, as separated from Christ, refut page 23.

2 That ye condemne al the Churches in Europe which professe the Gospell, that their people are but heapes of prophane men, disc page 33. That their worship is blasphemous Idolatrie, in as much as they haue liturgies, which is (as ye say) to haue another Gospell, another Testament. Refut. page 244. That there is no ministry of the Gospel in al Europ, Disc. page 104. that the gouernement of al Churches is false and wicked, Refut. page 74. 75. Discou. page 189. 190.

3 That ye confound errors and heresies, as to make all errors, heresies being conuinced to his conscience that erreth & held, and to make none to be heresies, vnles he be conuinced that erreth, Refu. page 24.

4 That with *Nouatus* the wicked heretick, ye take away all hope of saluatiō frō those which offend of knowledge willingly, in as much as ye make euery obstinate persisting in the least error, to separate frō the faith & Communion of Christ pa. 24.

5 That ye deny the distinction of errors fundamentall and not fundamentall, calling it popish. Refut. page 26.

6 That yee iudge of the whole Church to bee conuinced in conscience as of one man, page 24.

7 That ye hold it a due conuincing, not onely of particular persons, but also of whole Churches, and such as doth cast them forth as heathen, so soone as any priuat man dooth reproue the least error, & they forthwith do not reforme the same. page 24.

8 That ye condemne al without exception, both learned and vnlearned, men and wemen young and old, which professe the Gospell in publick assemblies, vpon false accusations, without admonition, & in matters wherein if there be errors, yet excellent godly men haue erred in them finally, euen by your owne confession. Refut. page 180.

9 That ye say the best part of the booke of common praier is no better then a peece of swines flesh, and abomination to the Lord. Refut page 48.

10 That ye say the greatest minister hath no more power to binde or loose the least member, then the said member hath to binde or loose him: and so with the Swinckfeldians, destroy the whole power of the ministry. page 37.

11 That ye speake so prophanely of singing of Psalmes, and so dishonorably of Christian people. Discou. page 180.

12 That most offensiuely and prophanely, ye tearme the articles of our faith, our forged patcherie. Discou. page 76.

13 That ye deny men are to ioyne in that worship, where any errors whatsoeuer doo appeare, and are not reformed, and so open a most wide gap vnto all Schismes. Refut page 27.

14 That you are so grosly ignorant how the false Apostles vrged circumcision, and so from the words of S. *Paule* to the *Galathians* affirme that paying tithes, or the obseruing any times as it is in our church, is an error fundamental. Refut. pa. 36

15. That ye iudge them to be no true Churches which haue not excommunication. pag. 54. 73.

16 That ye denie baptisme to the children of open sinners, which yet remayne in the Church. Refut. pag. 58. 59.

17 That ye make the stablenes of Gods couenant towards his Church to depend vpon the works of men. Refut. pag. 60.

18 That ye hold circūcision amōg the ten tribes, or in Iuda in time of Idolatrie, was no true seale of the couenant, & yet ye say that cōcerning the outward cutting it was true circūcision: the like ye say of baptisme administred in popery. Ref. pag. 64.

19 That in your Disc. from pag. 16. to pag. 45. and Refut.

pag. 97. ye take vpon ye to confute almost all which M Calvine hath written against the Donatists & Annabaptists, holding that the prayers and Sacraments, & the consciences of all that communicate together are defiled, where any open sinners are admitted.

20 That ye deny the distinction of the external court, & the court of conscience: & so take away the power of the ciuil magistrate, & the power of the Church in making lawes, in things indifferent, taking vpon ye to confute M. Cal. Disc. pa. 94. 95.

21 That ye condemne Logick, Rethorike and other liberal Artes. Refut. pag. 117.

22 That ye would haue al authors (the bible only excepted) cast aside in the study of diuinitie. Disc. pag. 146.

23 That ye wickedly blaspheme the operatiō & motions of Gods spirit in the harts of men at the preaching of the gospel, as if they were but the illusions of the diuel. Disco. pa. 141. 156

24 That ye speake so reprochfully of all the most excellent learned diuines which God hath raysed vp in al Churches, cōdemning them of pride, ignorance, rashnes, sensualitie, &c. Disco. from pag. 140. vnto pag. 191.

25 That ye still stand to maintaine, that priuate men may assemble and erect a Church with all the offices & officers. Refut. pag. 191.

26 That ye affirme there bee no true ministers any where to be found vpō earth, nor yet any extraordinary ministers to be looked for, & therfore meere priuate men are (as ye say) to erect and establish the Church. Refut. pag. 196.

27 That ye affirme these priuate men are not to stay for the Prince Refut. pag. 196.

28 That ye maintaine that no fault is to be tolerated in the church: but if any priuate man do espie a fault and reproue it, if they will not amend it he is to forsake that church. This is your whole practise.

I will not stand to lay open euery particular, but vpon these conclude, that seeing ye hold so many foule errors, and with such outrage to your deadly, God hath not sent ye, nor set ye a work, more then he sent the Donatists and Annabaptists, but Satan hath seduced ye, & ye labor to seduce others. And if it please God I beseech him for his sonnes sake to open your eyes, and to giue ye some spark of grace for your owne comfort.

FINIS.